arXiv:0910.1783v5 [math.AG] 4 Apr 2010

FIVE EMBEDDINGS OF ONE SIMPLE GROUP

IVAN CHELTSOV AND CONSTANTIN SHRAMOV

Abstract. We prove that $\mathrm{Bir}(\mathbb{P}^3)$ has at least five non-conjugate subgroups isomorphic to $\mathbb{A}_6$.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Preliminaries 5
3. Alternating group 9
4. Projective space 12
5. Segre cubic 21
6. Quadric threefold 27

Appendix A. Klein cubic threefold 29
Appendix B. Del Pezzo fibrations 32
References 34

We assume that all varieties are projective, normal, and defined over $\mathbb{C}$.

1. Introduction

Let $\tau\colon \bar{G}\to \mathrm{Cr}_3(\mathbb{C})$ be a monomorphism, where $\bar{G}$ is a finite group and $\mathrm{Cr}_3(\mathbb{C})=\mathrm{Bir}(\mathbb{P}^3)$.

Problem 1.1. Up to conjugation, find all subgroups in $\mathrm{Cr}_3(\mathbb{C})$ that are isomorphic to $\bar{G}$.

It is well-known (see [31, Section 4.2]) that there is a birational map $\xi\colon V \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^3$ such that

- the threefold V has terminal singularities,
- there exists a monomorphism $\upsilon\colon \bar{G}\to \mathrm{Aut}(V)$,
- for every element $g\in\bar{G}$, we have
$$\tau\big(g\big)=\xi\circ\upsilon\big(g\big)\circ\xi^{-1}\in \mathrm{Cr}_3\big(\mathbb{C}\big),$$
- there is a $\upsilon(\bar{G})$-Mori fibration $\pi\colon V\to S$ (see [7, Definition A.1]).

Definition 1.2. The quadruple (V,ξ,υ,π) is a Mori regularization of the pair $(\bar{G},\tau)$.

Let $\tau'\colon \bar{G}\to \mathrm{Cr}_3(\mathbb{C})$ be another monomorphism.

Question 1.3. How to decide whether $\tau(\bar{G})$ and $\tau'(\bar{G})$ are conjugate in $\mathrm{Cr}_3(\mathbb{C})$ or not?

Let (V',ξ',υ',π') be a Mori regularization of the pair $(\bar{G},\tau')$.

Theorem 1.4 ([14, Lemma 3.5])**.** The following assertions are equivalent:

- the subgroups $\tau(\bar{G})$ and $\tau'(\bar{G})$ are conjugate,
- there is a birational map $\rho\colon V\dashrightarrow V'$ such that for every $g\in\bar{G}$ there is $g'\in\bar{G}$ such that
$$\upsilon'\big(g'\big)=\rho\circ\upsilon\big(g\big)\circ\rho^{-1}\in\mathrm{Aut}\big(V'\big).$$

The first author was supported by the grants NSF DMS-0701465 and EPSRC EP/E048412/1, the second author was supported by the grants RFFI 08-01-00395-a, NSh-1987.2008.1 and EPSRC EP/E048412/1.

Corollary 1.5. Suppose that $\dim(S)=0$. Then $\tau(\bar{G})$ and $\tau'(\bar{G})$ are not conjugate if the threefolds V and V' are not isomorphic, and V is $\upsilon(\bar{G})$-birationally rigid (see [7, Definition A.3]).

Suppose, in addition, that $\bar{G}$ is a non-abelian simple group.

Theorem 1.6 ([31, Theorem 1.3])**.** One has

$$\bar{G}\in\Big\{\mathbb{A}_5,\mathbb{A}_6,\mathbb{PSL}\Big(2,\mathbb{F}_7\Big),\mathbb{A}_7,\mathbb{SL}\Big(2,\mathbb{F}_8\Big),\mathbb{O}'\Big(5,\mathbb{F}_3\Big)\Big\},$$

where $\mathbb{O}'(5,\mathbb{F}_3)$ is the commutator of the group $\mathbb{O}(5,\mathbb{F}_3)$.

Lemma 1.7. If $\dim(S)\neq 0$, then $\bar{G}\in\{\mathbb{A}_5,\mathbb{A}_6,\mathbb{PSL}(2,\mathbb{F}_7)\}$.

Proof. There exists a monomorphism $\bar{G}\to\mathrm{Bir}(\mathbb{P}^2)$. Now we can use [7, Theorem B.7]. ☐

By Theorem 1.6 and Lemma 1.7, if $\bar{G}\in\{\mathbb{A}_7,\mathbb{SL}(2,\mathbb{F}_8),\mathbb{O}'(5,\mathbb{F}_3)\}$, then $\dim(S)=0$.

Example 1.8. Suppose that V is a complete intersection in $\mathbb{P}^5$ that is given by

$$\sum_{i=0}^{5}x_i=\sigma_4\big(x_0,x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4,x_5\big)=0\subset\mathbb{P}^5\cong\mathrm{Proj}\Big(\mathbb{C}\big[x_0,x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4,x_5\big]\Big),$$

where σ_4 is the elementary symmetric form of degree 4. Put $\bar{G}=\mathbb{O}'(5,\mathbb{F}_3)$. Then

- there is a monomorphism $\upsilon\colon\bar{G}\to\mathrm{Aut}(V)$ (see [18, Chapter 5]),
- the threefold V is rational (see [18, Section 5.2.7]),
- the $\upsilon(\bar{G})$-invariant subgroup of the group $\mathrm{Cl}(V)$ is $\mathbb{Z}$ (cf. Theorem 1.16),
- it immediately follows from Theorem 1.16 that the threefold V is $\upsilon(\bar{G})$-birationally superrigid (see [7, Definition A.4], [5, Definition 0.3.4]).

The threefold constructed in Example 1.8 is known as the Burkhardt quartic (see [18]).

Example 1.9 ([31, Example 2.11])**.** Put $\bar{G}=\mathbb{SL}(2,\mathbb{F}_8)$. One can show that there is a monomorphism $\alpha\colon\bar{G}\to\mathrm{Aut}(\mathrm{LGr}(4,9))$, and

$$\mathrm{Pic}\Big(\mathrm{LGr}\big(4,9\big)\Big)=\mathbb{Z}\big[H\big],$$

where H is an ample divisor such that $|H|$ gives an embedding $\zeta\colon\mathrm{LGr}(4,9)\to\mathbb{P}^{15}$, which implies that the monomorphism α induces a monomorphism $\beta\colon\bar{G}\to\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^{15})$. Put

$$V=\zeta\Big(\mathrm{LGr}\big(4,9\big)\Big)\cap\Pi$$

where Π is the unique $\beta(\bar{G})$-invariant linear subspace $\Pi\subset\mathbb{P}^{15}$ such that $\dim(\Pi)=8$. Then

- the variety V is a smooth Fano threefold such that $\mathrm{Pic}(V)\cong\mathbb{Z}$ and $-K_V^3=12$ (see [28]),
- the monomorphism β induces the monomorphism $\upsilon\colon\bar{G}\to\mathrm{Aut}(V)$,
- the variety V is rational (see [19, Corollary 4.4.12]).

Note that there is a monomorphism $\upsilon\colon\bar{G}\to\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^3)\cong\mathbb{PGL}(4,\mathbb{C})$ if $\bar{G}=\mathbb{A}_7$ (see [13]).

Theorem 1.10. Suppose that $\bar{G}\in\{\mathbb{A}_7,\mathbb{SL}(2,\mathbb{F}_8),\mathbb{O}'(5,\mathbb{F}_3)\}$. Then

- if $\bar{G}\cong\mathbb{SL}(2,\mathbb{F}_8)$, then V is the threefold constructed in Example 1.9.
- if $\bar{G}\cong\mathbb{O}'(5,\mathbb{F}_3)$, then either $V\cong\mathbb{P}^3$ or V is the threefold constructed in Example 1.8,
- if $\bar{G}\cong\mathbb{A}_7$, then either $V\cong\mathbb{P}^3$ or V is isomorphic to a smooth complete intersection

  $$\sigma_1\big(x_0,\ldots,x_6\big)=\sigma_2\big(x_0,\ldots,x_6\big)=\sigma_3\big(x_0,\ldots,x_6\big)=0\subset\mathbb{P}^6\cong\mathrm{Proj}\Big(\mathbb{C}\big[x_0,\ldots,x_6\big]\Big),$$

  where σ_i is a symmetric form of degree i.

Proof. By [31, Theorem 1.5], there exists a $\bar{G}$-equivariant birational map $\chi\colon V\dashrightarrow U$ such that

- if $\bar{G}\cong\mathbb{SL}(2,\mathbb{F}_8)$, then U is the threefold constructed in Example 1.9.

- if $\bar{G}\cong\mathbb{O}'(5,\mathbb{F}_3)$, then either $U\cong\mathbb{P}^3$ or U is the threefold constructed in Example 1.8,
- if $\bar{G}\cong\mathbb{A}_7$, then either $U\cong\mathbb{P}^3$ or U is isomorphic to a smooth complete intersection
  $$\sigma_1\big(x_0,\ldots,x_6\big)=\sigma_2\big(x_0,\ldots,x_6\big)=\sigma_3\big(x_0,\ldots,x_6\big)=0\subset\mathbb{P}^6\cong\mathrm{Proj}\Big(\mathbb{C}\big[x_0,\ldots,x_6\big]\Big),$$
  where σ_i is a symmetric form of degree i.

It follows from the proof of [31, Theorem 1.5] that χ is a biregular map. □

Corollary 1.11. Up to conjugation, the group $\mathrm{Cr}_3(\mathbb{C})$ contains

- exactly 1 subgroup that is isomorphic to $\mathbb{SL}(2,\mathbb{F}_8)$,
- exactly 2 subgroups that are isomorphic to $\mathbb{O}'(5,\mathbb{F}_3)$,
- at most 2 subgroups[1] that are isomorphic to $\mathbb{A}_7$.

Suppose, in addition, that $\bar{G}\cong\mathbb{A}_6$.

Remark 1.12. By Theorem B.1 one has $V\cong\mathbb{P}^2\times\mathbb{P}^1$ if $\dim(S)=1$.

Let us consider three cases when the $\upsilon(\bar{G})$-invariant subgroup of the group $\mathrm{Cl}(V)$ is $\mathbb{Z}$.

Example 1.13. Put $V=\mathbb{P}^3$. Then there exists a monomorphism $2.\mathbb{A}_6\to\mathbb{SL}(4,\mathbb{C})$ (see [13]), which induces a monomorphism $\upsilon\colon\bar{G}\to\mathrm{Aut}(V)\cong\mathbb{PGL}(4,\mathbb{C})$.

Example 1.14. Let V be a smooth quadric threefold. Then V can be given by

$$\sum_{i=0}^{5}x_i=\sum_{i=0}^{5}x_i^2=0\subset\mathbb{P}^5\cong\mathrm{Proj}\Big(\mathbb{C}\big[x_0,x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4,x_5\big]\Big),$$

which implies the existence of a monomorphism $\upsilon\colon\bar{G}\to\mathrm{Aut}(V)$.

Example 1.15. If V is the complete intersection

$$\sum_{i=0}^{5}x_i=\sum_{i=0}^{5}x_i^3=0\subset\mathbb{P}^5\cong\mathrm{Proj}\Big(\mathbb{C}\big[x_0,x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4,x_5\big]\Big),$$

then the threefold V has exactly 10 isolated ordinary double points (and hence V is rational), and there exists a natural monomorphism $\upsilon\colon\bar{G}\to\mathrm{Aut}(V)$.

The threefold constructed in Example 1.15 is known as the Segre cubic (see [18, Section 3.2]).

Theorem 1.16 (cf. [26, Theorem 5], [34, Section 9])**.** Let V be the Burkhardt quartic. Then

- the $\upsilon(\bar{G})$-invariant subgroup of the group $\mathrm{Cl}(V)$ is $\mathbb{Z}$,
- the threefold V is $\upsilon(\bar{G})$-birationally superrigid.

Proof. The group $\upsilon(\bar{G})$ contains a subgroup $\bar{F}\cong\mathbb{S}_4$ that fixes a point in $\mathrm{Sing}(V)$. One has

$$V/\bar{F}\cong\mathbb{P}\big(1,2,2,3\big),$$

which implies that the $\upsilon(\bar{G})$-invariant subgroup of the group $\mathrm{Cl}(V)$ is $\mathbb{Z}$.

Suppose that V is not $\upsilon(\bar{G})$-birationally superrigid. Then [11, Theorem 4.2] implies the existence of a $\upsilon(\bar{G})$-invariant linear system $\mathcal{M}$ on the threefold V such that

- the linear system $\mathcal{M}$ does not have fixed components,
- the log pair $(V,\lambda\mathcal{M})$ is not canonical, where $\lambda\in\mathbb{Q}$ is such that $K_V+\lambda\mathcal{M}\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}0$.

---

[1] We do not know whether the complete intersection of a quadric and a cubic mentioned in Theorem 1.10 is rational or not, but we expect it is not (cf. [20, Chapter 3], [19, Theorem 9.1.6], [12, Theorem 6.3]).

Let M_1 and M_2 be sufficiently general surfaces in the linear system $\mathcal{M}$, and let H be a general surface in $|-K_V|$. Consider V as a quartic threefold in $\mathbb{P}^4$.

Suppose that there is an irreducible curve $C \subset V$ such that the log pair $(V, \lambda\mathcal{M})$ is not canonical along the curve C. Let Z be the $\upsilon(\bar{G})$-orbit of the curve C. Put $d = -K_V \cdot Z$. Then

$$4/\lambda^2 = M_1 \cdot M_2 \cdot H \geqslant d\mathrm{mult}_C\big(M_1\big)\mathrm{mult}_C\big(M_2\big) > d/\lambda^2,$$

which implies that $d \leqslant 3$. So, the curve Z is contained in a hyperplane in $\mathbb{P}^4$, which is impossible, because the corresponding five-dimensional representation of the group $\bar{G}$ is irreducible.

Take any point $P \in V$ such that the singularities of the log pair $(V, \lambda\mathcal{M})$ are not canonical at the point P. Then the quartic V is singular at P by [12, Corollary 3.4].

Let Σ be the $\upsilon(\bar{G})$-orbit of the point $P \in V$. Then there is a subset $\Gamma \subset \Sigma$ such that $|\Gamma| = 4$, and the set Γ is not contained in any two-dimensional linear subspace of $\mathbb{P}^4$.

Let $\mathcal{Q} \subset |-2K_V|$ be a linear subsystem that consists of all surfaces in $|-2K_W|$ that pass through every point of the set Γ. Then the base locus of the linear system $\mathcal{Q}$ is the set Γ.

Let $\pi\colon U \to V$ be a blow up of the set Γ, and let $E_1, \ldots, E_4$ be the π-exceptional divisors. Then

$$\bar{\mathcal{M}} \sim \pi^*\big(\mathcal{M}\big) - m\Big(E_1 + E_2 + E_3 + E_4\Big),$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ is the proper transforms of the linear system $\mathcal{M}$ on the variety U, and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$.

It follows from [5, Theorem 1.7.20] that $m > 1/\lambda$ (cf. [12, Theorem 3.10]).

Let Υ be the intersection of two sufficiently general surfaces in $\mathcal{Q}$, and let $\bar{\Upsilon}$ be the proper transform of the curve Υ on the threefold U. Then

$$0 > 8/\lambda - 8m > 8/\lambda - m\sum_{O\in\Gamma}\mathrm{mult}_O\big(\Gamma\big) = \bar{M}\cdot\Gamma \geqslant 0,$$

where $\bar{M}$ is a general surface in $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$. The obtained contradiction completes the proof. □

The main purpose of this paper is to prove the following result.

Theorem 1.17. The following assertions hold:

- if $V \cong \mathbb{P}^3$ and $\upsilon\colon \bar{G} \to \mathrm{Aut}(V)$ is the monomorphism that is constructed in Example 1.13, then the threefold V is $\upsilon(\bar{G})$-birationally rigid and
$$\mathbb{S}_6 \cong \mathrm{Aut}^{\upsilon(\bar{G})}\big(V\big) \neq \mathrm{Bir}^{\upsilon(\bar{G})}\big(V\big) \cong \mathbb{S}_6 \bigstar_{\mathbb{A}_6} \mathbb{S}_6,$$
where $\mathbb{S}_6 \bigstar_{\mathbb{A}_6} \mathbb{S}_6$ is the free product of $\mathbb{S}_6$ and $\mathbb{S}_6$ with amalgamated subgroup $\mathbb{A}_6$,
- if V is the Segre cubic, then V is $\upsilon(\bar{G})$-birationally superrigid,
- if V is the smooth quadric threefold, then V is $\upsilon(\bar{G})$-birationally superrigid.

Proof. The required assertion follows from Theorems 4.7, 5.6 and 6.2. □

Corollary 1.18. Up to conjugation, there are at least 5 subgroups in $\mathrm{Cr}_3(\mathbb{C})$ isomorphic to $\mathbb{A}_6$.

To prove Theorems 4.7, 5.6 and 6.2, we use the following tools:

- the Noether–Fano inequality (see Lemma 4.11, [11, Theorem 4.2], [5, Theorem 1.4.1]),
- the "multiplication by two" trick (see Remark 4.13 and Lemma 5.8),
- the Nadel–Shokurov vanishing theorem (see Theorem 2.1, [24, Theorem 9.4.8])
- the Shokurov connectedness principle (see Theorem 2.3, [33, Lemma 5.7]),
- the Inversion of Adjunction (see Theorem 2.4, [23, Theorem 7.5]),
- the Kawamata subadjunction theorem (see Theorem 2.6, [22, Theorem 1]),
- the Kawamata–Shokurov trick (see Lemma 2.10, the proof of [21, Theorem 1.10]),
- the representation theory of the group $\mathbb{A}_6$ and its subgroups (see Section 3, [13]),
- the construction of the Todd involution in $\mathrm{Cr}_3(\mathbb{C})$ of degree 19 (see Lemma 4.4, [37]),
- the following classical results:
  - the Riemann–Roch theorem (see [16, Theorem 1.3], [2, Section I.2]),

- the Clifford theorem (see Theorem 2.17, [16, Theorem 5.4], [2, Section III.1]),
- the Castelnuovo bound (see Theorem 2.16, [16, Theorem 6.4], [2, Section III.2]),
- the Riemann–Hurwitz formula (cf. Lemma 2.8, [2, Section I.2]),
- the Corti inequality (see [12, Theorem 3.1]).

In Appendix A, we answer a question posed in [31, Remark 2.10].

We thank T. Dokchitser, I. Dolgachev, Y. Prokhorov, L. Rybnikov, E. Smirnov for discussions.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let X be a variety with at most Kawamata log terminal singularities (see [23, Definition 3.5]), let B_X be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on the variety X such that (X, B_X) is log canonical. Then

$$B_X = \sum_{i=1}^{r} a_i B_i,$$

where $a_i \in \mathbb{Q}$, and B_i is a prime Weil divisor on the variety X.

Let $\pi\colon \bar{X} \to X$ be a birational morphism such that $\bar{X}$ is smooth. Then

$$K_{\bar{X}} + \sum_{i=1}^{r} a_i \bar{B}_i \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \pi^*\Big(K_X + B_X\Big) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i E_i,$$

where B_i is the proper transforms of the divisor B_i on the variety $\bar{X}$, and E_i is an exceptional divisor of the morphism π, and d_i is a rational number. We may assume that

$$\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{r} \bar{B}_i\right) \bigcup \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{m} E_i\right)$$

is a divisor with simple normal crossing. Put

$$\mathcal{I}\Big(X, B_X\Big) = \pi_*\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \lceil d_i \rceil E_i - \sum_{i=1}^{r} \lfloor a_i \rfloor B_i\right).$$

Theorem 2.1 ([24, Theorem 9.4.8]). Let H be a nef and big $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on X such that

$$K_X + B_X + H \equiv D$$

for some Cartier divisor D on the variety X. Take $i \geqslant 1$. Then

$$H^i\Big(\mathcal{I}\Big(X, B_X\Big) \otimes D\Big) = 0.$$

Let $\mathcal{L}(X, B_X)$ be a subscheme that corresponds to the ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I}(X, B_X)$. Put

$$\mathrm{LCS}\Big(X, B_X\Big) = \mathrm{Supp}\Big(\mathcal{L}\Big(X, B_X\Big)\Big).$$

Remark 2.2. The subscheme $\mathcal{L}(X, B_X)$ is reduced, because (X, B_X) is log canonical.

Let $\zeta\colon X \to Z$ be a surjective morphism with connected fibers.

Theorem 2.3 ([33, Lemma 5.7], [21, Theorem 1.4]). Let F be a fiber of ζ. Then the locus

$$\mathrm{LCS}\Big(X, B_X\Big) \cap F$$

is connected if $-(K_X + B_X)$ is η-nef and η-big.

Recall that there are standard names for $\mathcal{I}(X, B_X)$, $\mathcal{L}(X, B_X)$ and $\mathrm{LCS}(X, B_X)$:

- $\mathcal{I}(X, B_X)$ is known as the multiplier ideal sheaf (see [24, Section 9.2]),
- $\mathcal{L}(X, B_X)$ is known as the log canonical singularities subscheme (see [5, Definition 1.7.5]),

- $\mathrm{LCS}(X, B_X)$ is known as the locus of log canonical singularities (see [33, Definition 3.14]).

Theorem 2.4 ([23, Theorem 7.5])**.** Suppose that $a_1 = 1$, and B_1 is a Cartier divisor that is a variety with Kawamata log terminal singularities. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

- the log pair (X, B_X) is log canonical along B_1;
- the singularities of the log pair
$$\left(B_1,\ \sum_{i=2}^{r} a_i B_i\Big|_{B_1}\right)$$
are log canonical.

Let Z be a center of log canonical singularities of the log pair (X, B_X) (see [21, Definition 1.3]), and let $\mathbb{LCS}(X, B_X)$ be the set of all centers of log canonical singularities of the log pair (X, B_X).

Lemma 2.5 ([21, Proposition 1.5])**.** Let Z' be an element of the set $\mathbb{LCS}(X, B_X)$ such that
$$\varnothing \neq Z \cap Z' = \sum_{i=1}^{k} Z_i,$$
where $Z_i \subsetneq Z$ is an irreducible subvariety. Then $Z_i \in \mathbb{LCS}(X, B_X)$ for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$.

Suppose that Z is a minimal center in $\mathbb{LCS}(X, B_X)$ (see [21], [22], [9, Definition 2.8]).

Theorem 2.6 ([22, Theorem 1])**.** Let Δ be an ample $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor on X. Then

- the variety Z is normal and has at most rational singularities,
- there exists an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor B_Z on the variety Z such that
$$\Big(K_X + B_X + \Delta\Big)\Big|_Z \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} K_Z + B_Z,$$
and (Z, B_Z) has Kawamata log terminal singularities.

Let $\bar{G} \subseteq \mathrm{Aut}(X)$ be a finite subgroup.

Lemma 2.7. Suppose that X is a curve. Let $\Sigma \subset X$ be a $\bar{G}$-orbit. Then

- if $|\Sigma| = 1$, then $\bar{G}$ is cyclic,
- if $\bar{G} \cong \mathbb{A}_5$, then $|\Sigma| \in \{12, 20, 30, 60\}$,
- if $\bar{G} \cong \mathbb{A}_6$, then $|\Sigma| \in \{60, 72, 90, 120, 180, 360\}$.

Proof. If Σ is a point, then $\bar{G}$ acts faithfully on the tangent space to X at the point Σ. □

Lemma 2.8. Suppose that X is a curve of genus g and $\bar{G} \cong \mathbb{A}_6$. Then

- if $g \leqslant 34$, then $g \in \{10, 16, 19, 25, 31\}$,
- if $g = 10$, then X does not contain $\bar{G}$-orbits of length 120.

Proof. Let $\bar{F} \subset \bar{G}$ be a stabilizer of a point in X. Then
$$\bar{F} \cong \mathbb{Z}_k$$
for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ by Lemma 2.7.

Put $\bar{X} = X/\bar{G}$. Then $\bar{X}$ is a smooth curve of genus $\bar{g}$. The Riemann–Hurwitz formula gives
$$2g - 2 = 360\big(2\bar{g} - 2\big) + 180a_2 + 240a_3 + 270a_4 + 288a_5 + 300a_6,$$
where a_k is the number of $\bar{G}$-orbits in X with a stabilizer of a point isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_k$.

Suppose that $g \leqslant 34$. Note that $g \neq 0$ by the classification of finite subgroups of $\mathbb{PGL}(2, \mathbb{C})$, and $g \neq 1$ since $\bar{G}$ is non-solvable. Since $a_k \geqslant 0$, one has $\bar{g} = 0$, and
$$2g - 2 = -720 + 180a_2 + 240a_3 + 270a_4 + 288a_5 + 300a_6, \tag{2.9}$$

which implies that $g \in \{10, 16, 19, 25, 31\}$. The only solution to (2.9) for $g = 10$ is

$$\big(a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5, a_6\big) = \big(1, 0, 1, 1, 0\big),$$

which completes the proof. ☐

Suppose, in addition, that the divisor B_X is $\bar{G}$-invariant. Then

$$g\big(Z\big) \in \mathbb{LCS}\Big(X, B_X\Big)$$

for every $g \in \bar{G}$, and the locus $\mathrm{LCS}(X, B_X)$ is $\bar{G}$-invariant. It follows from Lemma 2.5 that

$$g\big(Z\big) \cap g'\big(Z\big) \neq \varnothing \iff g\big(Z\big) = g'\big(Z\big)$$

for every $g \in \bar{G} \ni g'$, because Z is a minimal center in $\mathbb{LCS}(X, B_X)$.

Lemma 2.10. Suppose that the divisor B_X is ample. Let ϵ be an arbitrary rational number such that $\epsilon > 1$. Then there exists an effective $\bar{G}$-invariant $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D on the variety X such that

$$\mathbb{LCS}\Big(X, D\Big) = \bigcup_{g \in \bar{G}} \Big\{g\big(Z\big)\Big\},$$

the log pair (X, D) is log canonical, and the equivalence $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \epsilon(B_X)$ holds.

Proof. See the proofs of [21, Theorem 1.10], [22, Theorem 1], [9, Lemma 2.11]. ☐

Suppose, in addition, that X is a Fano variety. Put

$$\mathrm{lct}\Big(X, \bar{G}\Big) = \sup\left\{\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}\ \middle|\ \begin{array}{l}\text{the log pair } \big(X, \lambda D\big) \text{ has log canonical singularities}\\ \text{for every } \bar{G}\text{-invariant effective } \mathbb{Q}\text{-divisor } D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_X\end{array}\right\} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Remark 2.11. If the variety X is smooth, then it follows from [8, Theorem A.3] that

$$\mathrm{lct}\Big(X, \bar{G}\Big) = \alpha_{\bar{G}}\big(X\big),$$

where $\alpha_{\bar{G}}(X)$ is the $\bar{G}$-invariant α-invariant of the variety X introduced in [35] and [36].

Suppose that $X \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$.

Lemma 2.12. Suppose that $\bar{G} \cong \mathbb{A}_5$. Let $\Sigma \subset X$ be a $\bar{G}$-invariant subset. Then $|\Sigma| \geqslant 12$.

Proof. The required assertion follows from Lemma 2.7. ☐

Let $L_1 \subset X \supset L_2$ be curves such that $L_1^2 = L_2^2 = 0$ and $L_1 \cdot L_2 = 1$.

Lemma 2.13. The following conditions are equivalent:

- the inequality $\mathrm{lct}(X, \bar{G}) \geqslant 1$ holds,
- the linear systems $|L_1|$, $|L_2|$, $|L_1 + L_2|$ contain no $\bar{G}$-invariant curves.

Proof. If there is a $\bar{G}$-invariant curve in $|L_1|$ or $|L_2|$ or $|L_1 + L_2|$, then the equality

$$\mathrm{lct}\big(X, \bar{G}\big) = \frac{1}{2}$$

holds (see [6, Theorem 1.7]).

Suppose that $|L_1|$, $|L_2|$, $|L_1 + L_2|$ contain no $\bar{G}$-invariant curves, but $\mathrm{lct}(X, \bar{G}) < 1$.

There are $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$ and an effective $\bar{G}$-invariant $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D on X such that $\lambda < 1$ and

$$D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -K_X \sim 2\Big(L_1 + L_2\Big),$$

but $(X, \lambda D)$ is not Kawamata log terminal. We may assume that $(X, \lambda D)$ is log canonical.

Suppose that there is a $\bar{G}$-invariant curve $C \subset X$ such that

$$\lambda D = \mu C + \Omega,$$

where $\mu \geqslant 1$, and Ω is an effective $\bar{G}$-invariant $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor, whose support does not contain any component of the curve C. Then

$$C \sim aL_1 + bL_2$$

for some non-negative integers a and b. Then either $a \geqslant 2$ or $b \geqslant 2$. But

$$2 > 2\lambda = \lambda\Big(D \cdot L_1\Big) = \Big(\mu C + \Omega\Big) \cdot L_1 \geqslant C \cdot L_1 = b,$$

which implies that $b \leqslant 1$. Similarly, we see that $a = C \cdot L_2 \leqslant 1$, which is a contradiction.

We see that the locus $\mathrm{LCS}(X, \lambda D)$ is a finite $\bar{G}$-invariant set. Thus, the locus $\mathrm{LCS}(X, \lambda D)$ consists of a single point $O \in X$ by Theorem 2.3.

Let H be the unique curve in $|L_1 + L_2|$ that is singular at O. Then H must be $\bar{G}$-invariant, which is a contradiction, because the linear system $|L_1+L_2|$ contains no $\bar{G}$-invariant divisors. □

Let us identify $X \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ with a smooth quadric surface in $\mathbb{P}^3$, and let us identify $\bar{G}$ with a subgroup in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^3)$ such that X is $\bar{G}$-invariant. There is a subgroup $G \subset \mathbb{SL}(4, \mathbb{C})$ such that

$$\bar{G} = \phi(G) \subset \mathrm{Aut}\Big(\mathbb{P}^3\Big) \cong \mathbb{PGL}\Big(4, \mathbb{C}\Big),$$

where $\phi\colon \mathbb{SL}(4, \mathbb{C}) \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^3)$ is the natural projection. Put $W = \mathbb{C}^4$

Lemma 2.14. Suppose that W is an irreducible representation of the group $G \cong \bar{G} \cong \mathbb{A}_5$, and

$$B_X \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} mL_1 + \big(8 - m\big)L_2,$$

where m is a rational number such that $1 < m < 2$. Then $|\mathrm{LCS}(X, B_X)| < +\infty$.

Proof. It follows from explicit computations that $|L_1 + nL_2|$ contains no $\bar{G}$-invariant curves for any $n \leqslant 6$. By Lemma 2.7, the linear system $|nL_2|$ contains no $\bar{G}$-invariant curves for any $n \leqslant 11$.

Suppose that $|\mathrm{LCS}(X, B_X)| = +\infty$. Then there is a $\bar{G}$-invariant curve $C \subset X$ such that

$$B_X = \mu C + \Omega,$$

where $\mu \geqslant 1$, and Ω is an effective $\bar{G}$-invariant $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor, whose support does not contain any component of the curve C. Then

$$C \sim aL_1 + bL_2$$

for some non-negative integers a and b. Then either $a \geqslant 2$ or $b \geqslant 2$. But

$$2 > m = B_X \cdot L_2 = \Big(\mu C + \Omega\Big) \cdot L_2 \geqslant C \cdot L_2 = a,$$

which implies that either $a = 0$ or $a = 1$. Similarly, we see that

$$7 > 8 - m = B_X \cdot L_1 = \Big(\mu C + \Omega\Big) \cdot L_1 \geqslant C \cdot L_1 = b,$$

which implies that $b \leqslant 6$, which is a contradiction. □

Let C be a smooth irreducible curve of genus g.

Theorem 2.15. Suppose that $g \geqslant 2$. Then

$$\Big|\mathrm{Aut}(C)\Big| \leqslant \begin{cases} 320 \text{ if } g = 9, \\ 432 \text{ if } g = 10, \\ 240 \text{ if } g = 11, \\ 120 \text{ if } g = 12, \\ 360 \text{ if } g = 13, \\ 504 \text{ if } g = 15, \end{cases}$$

and the inequality $|\mathrm{Aut}(C)| \leqslant 84(g - 1)$ holds for any $g \geqslant 2$.

Proof. The inequality $|\mathrm{Aut}(C)| \leqslant 84(g-1)$ is the famous Hurwitz bound (see [4, Theorem 3.17]), the exact bounds for particular genera may be found in [4, Table 13]. □

Let D be an effective divisor on the curve C.

Theorem 2.16. Suppose that $h^1(\mathcal{O}_C(D)) \neq 0$. Then

$$h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_C(D)\Big) \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{deg}(D).$$

Proof. See [16, Theorem 5.4] or [2, Section III.1]. □

Suppose that there is an embedding $\zeta\colon C \to \mathbb{P}^n$ such that $\zeta(C)$ is a curve of degree d.

Theorem 2.17. Suppose that $\zeta(C)$ is not contained in any hyperplane in $\mathbb{P}^n$. Then

$$g \leqslant \frac{m(m-1)(n-1)}{2} + m\varepsilon,$$

where $m = \lfloor (d-1)/(n-1) \rfloor$ and $\varepsilon = d - 1 - m(n-1)$.

Proof. See [2, Section III.2]. □

3. Alternating group

Let $\mathbb{S}_6$ be the group of permutations of the set $\{1,2,3,4,5,6\}$.

Definition 3.1. Let $H \subset \mathbb{A}_6$ be a subgroup that is isomorphic to $\mathbb{A}_5$, $\mathbb{S}_4$ or $\mathbb{A}_4$. Then we say that the embedding $H \subset \mathbb{A}_6$ is standard if one of the following conditions is satisfied:

- if $H \cong \mathbb{A}_5$ and H is conjugate to the subgroup of even permutations of $\{1,2,3,4,5\}$,
- if $H \cong \mathbb{S}_4$ and H is conjugate to the subgroup of permutations of the set
$$\big\{1,2,3,4\big\}$$
such that the odd permutations of $\{1,2,3,4\}$ are twisted by the transposition $(5,6)$,
- if $H \cong \mathbb{A}_4$ and H is conjugate to the subgroup of even permutations of $\{1,2,3,4\}$.

We say that the embedding $H \subset \mathbb{A}_6$ is non-standard if it is not standard[2].

Let $2.\mathbb{A}_6$ be the group such that there exists a non-splitting exact sequence of groups

$$\begin{tikzcd} 1 \arrow[r] & \mathbb{Z}_2 \arrow[r, "\alpha"] & 2.\mathbb{A}_6 \arrow[r, "\beta"] & \mathbb{A}_6 \arrow[r] & 1 \end{tikzcd}.$$

Note that $\alpha(\mathbb{Z}_2)$ is the center of the group $2.\mathbb{A}_6$.

Definition 3.2. Let $H \subset 2.\mathbb{A}_6$ such that $\beta(H)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{A}_5$, $\mathbb{S}_4$ or $\mathbb{A}_4$. Then

- we say that the embedding $H \subset 2.\mathbb{A}_6$ is standard if $\beta(H) \subset \mathbb{A}_6$ is standard,
- we say that the embedding $H \subset 2.\mathbb{A}_6$ is non-standard if $\beta(H) \subset \mathbb{A}_6$ is non-standard.

Let $\bar{G}$ be a finite subgroup in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^3)$ such that $\bar{G} \cong \mathbb{A}_6$.

Lemma 3.3 ([13])**.** Every maximal proper subgroup of the group $\bar{G} \cong \mathbb{A}_6$ is isomorphic to either to $\mathbb{A}_5$, or $\mathbb{S}_4$, or $(\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_4$. Moreover, up to conjugation, the group $\bar{G}$ contains

- one subgroup isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_4$,
- one subgroup isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$,
- two subgroups isomorphic to $\mathbb{S}_4$ (respectively, $\mathbb{A}_5$, $\mathbb{A}_4$).

Put $V = \mathbb{C}^4$. There exists a finite subgroup $G \subset \mathbb{SL}(4,\mathbb{C})$ such that $G \cong 2.\mathbb{A}_6$ and

$$\bar{G} = \phi(G) \subset \mathrm{Aut}\Big(\mathbb{P}^3\Big) \cong \mathbb{PGL}\Big(4,\mathbb{C}\Big),$$

where $\phi\colon \mathbb{SL}(4,\mathbb{C}) \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^3)$ is the natural projection.

---

[2] Note that the non-standard and standard embeddings of the group H into $\mathbb{A}_6$ are interchanged by $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{A}_6)$.

Remark 3.4. The group G has two irreducible four-dimensional representations (see [13]), which implies that we may identify V with one of them, because another one differs from V by an outer automorphism of the group G. Thus, we may assume that the natural action of the group G on

$$\Lambda^2(V)\cong\mathbb{C}^6$$

arises from the permutation representation of the group $\bar{G}\cong\mathbb{A}_6$.

Let $\bar{F}\subset\bar{G}$ be a subgroup, and let $F\subset G$ be a subgroup such that $\phi(F)=\bar{F}$.

Remark 3.5. Suppose that $F\cong 2.\mathbb{A}_5\subset 2.\mathbb{A}_6$. Then

$$\mathbb{C}^4\cong V\cong\begin{cases}U\oplus U' \text{ if } F\subset G \text{ is standard,}\\ \mathrm{Sym}^3(U)\cong\mathrm{Sym}^3(U') \text{ if } F\subset G \text{ is non-standard,}\end{cases}$$

where U and U' are different two-dimensional representations of the group $F\cong 2.\mathbb{A}_5$.

Lemma 3.6. Suppose that $F\cong 2.\mathbb{A}_5$ and $F\subset G$ is a non-standard embedding. Then there exists an irreducible $\bar{F}$-invariant smooth rational cubic curve $Z\subset\mathbb{P}^3$.

Proof. The required assertion follows from Remark 3.5. □

Let z and e be the non-trivial element in the center of G and the identity element, respectively.

Lemma 3.7 (cf. [9, Lemma 4.7])**.** The following assertions hold:

- any semi-invariant of the group G is its invariant,
- the group G does not have invariants of odd degree,
- the group G does not have invariants of degree at most 7,
- the group G has two linearly independent invariants of degree 8.

Proof. Semi-invariants of the group G are its invariants, because the center of the group G is contained in its commutator, and the group $\bar{G}$ is a simple non-abelian group.

The group G does not have invariants of odd degree, because G contains a scalar matrix whose non-zero entries are -1. Therefore, to prove that G has no invariants of degree at most 7, it is enough to show that G does not have invariants of degree 4 and 6.

Let χ_m be the character of the representation $\mathrm{Sym}^m(V)$ (cf. Remark 3.4). Put $\chi=\chi_1$.

The values of the characters χ, χ_4, χ_6 and χ_8 are listed in the following table:

	$[5,1]_{10}$	$[5,1]_5$	$[4,2]_8$	$[3,3]_6$	$[3,3]_3$	$[3,1,1,1]_6$	$[3,1,1,1]_3$	$[2,2,1,1]_4$	z	e
#	144	144	180	40	40	40	40	90	1	1
χ	1	-1	0	-1	1	2	-2	0	-4	4
χ_4	0	0	-1	2	2	-4	-4	3	35	35
χ_6	-1	-1	0	3	3	3	3	-4	84	84
χ_8	0	0	1	3	3	3	3	5	165	165

where the first row lists the types of the elements in G (for example, the symbol $[5,1]_{10}$ denotes the set[3] of elements of order 10 whose image in $\mathbb{A}_6$ is a product of disjoint cycles of length 5 and 1).

Recall that there is a natural inner product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ defined for the characters θ and θ' by

$$\langle\theta,\theta'\rangle=\frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{g\in G}\theta(g)\theta'(g).$$

---

[3] Note that these sets do not coincide with conjugacy classes. For example, the image of the set of the elements of type $[5,1]_{10}$ under the natural projection $2.\mathbb{A}_6\to\mathbb{A}_6$ is a union of two different conjugacy classes in $\mathbb{A}_6$.

Let χ_0 be the trivial character of G. Then

$$\langle\chi_4,\chi_0\rangle=\langle\chi_6,\chi_0\rangle=0,$$

so that G has no invariants of degree 4 and 6. On the other hand, $\langle\chi_8,\chi_0\rangle=2$, which means that the group G has exactly two linearly independent invariants of degree 8. ☐

Suppose that $\bar{F}$ is a stabilizer of a point $P\in\mathbb{P}^3$.

Lemma 3.8. Let $\Sigma\subset\mathbb{P}^3$ be the $\bar{G}$-orbit of the point $P\in\mathbb{P}^3$. Then $|\Sigma|\geqslant 36$.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 3.7 that $|\Sigma|\geqslant 8$ and $|\Sigma|$ is even. Suppose that $|\Sigma|\leqslant 35$. Then

$$45=\frac{|\bar{G}|}{8}\geqslant\big|\bar{F}\big|\geqslant\frac{|\bar{G}|}{35}>10,$$

which implies that $|\bar{F}|\in\{12,18,36\}$ by Lemma 3.3.

Let us consider the vector space V as a representation of the group F, and let χ be its character. There is a homomorphism $\theta\colon F\to\mathbb{C}^*$ such that the inner product $\langle\theta,\chi\rangle\neq 0$.

Suppose that $|\bar{F}|=36$. Then $\bar{F}\cong(\mathbb{Z}_3\times\mathbb{Z}_3)\rtimes\mathbb{Z}_4$ by Lemma 3.3.

The structure of the group F and the values of χ are given in the following table:

	$[4,2]_8$	$[3,3]_6$	$[3,3]_3$	$[3,1,1,1]_6$	$[3,1,1,1]_3$	$[2,2,1,1]_4$	z	e
#	36	4	4	4	4	18	1	1
χ	0	-1	1	2	-2	0	-4	4

where we use the notation that are used in the proof of Lemma 3.7.

We have $[F,F]\cong 2.(\mathbb{Z}_3\times\mathbb{Z}_3)$, which gives

$$\theta(g)=1$$

for any $g\in F$ that is not of type $[4,2]_8$ and $[2,2]_4$. Hence $\langle\theta,\chi\rangle=0$, which is a contradiction.

Suppose that $|\bar{F}|=18$. Then

$$\bar{F}\cong\Big(\mathbb{Z}_3\times\mathbb{Z}_3\Big)\rtimes\mathbb{Z}_2$$

by Lemma 3.3. Arguing as above, we get $\langle\theta,\chi\rangle=0$.

Suppose that $|\bar{F}|=12$. Then $\bar{F}\cong\mathbb{A}_4$ by Lemma 3.3.

Up to conjugation, the group $\bar{G}$ contains two subgroups isomorphic to $\mathbb{A}_4$.

If $\bar{F}\subset\bar{G}$ is a standard embedding, then the values of χ are given in the following table:

	$[3,1,1,1]_6$	$[3,1,1,1]_3$	$[2,2,1,1]_4$	z	e
#	8	8	6	1	1
χ	2	-2	0	-4	4

If $\bar{F}\subset\bar{G}$ is a non-standard embedding, then the values of χ are given in the following table:

	$[3,3]_6$	$[3,3]_3$	$[2,2,1,1]_4$	z	e
#	8	8	6	1	1
χ	-1	1	0	-4	4

We have $[F,F]\cong 2.(\mathbb{Z}_2\times\mathbb{Z}_2)$. So $\theta(g)=1$ for any $g\in F$ of order different from 3 and 6, and

$$\theta(g)=\theta(g^2)$$

for all $g\in F$ of order 6. Now we can check that $\langle\theta,\chi\rangle=0$, which is a contradiction. ☐

Suppose that there exists an irreducible $\bar{G}$-invariant curve $C\subset\mathbb{P}^3$ of degree d.

Lemma 3.9. Suppose that C is a smooth curve of genus $g \geqslant 13$. Then

$$h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)\otimes\mathcal{I}\Big)=h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2)\otimes\mathcal{I}\Big)=h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3)\otimes\mathcal{I}\Big)=0,$$

where $\mathcal{I}$ is the ideal sheaf of the curve $C\subset\mathbb{P}^3$.

Proof. It follows from Theorem 2.17 and Lemma 2.8 that $d>4$. Hence, we have

$$h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2)\otimes\mathcal{I}\Big)=0$$

by Lemma 3.7.

Suppose that there is a cubic surface $X\subset\mathbb{P}^3$ such that $C\subset X$. Then

$$h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3)\otimes\mathcal{I}\Big)\geqslant 2$$

by Lemma 3.7. There is a cubic surface $X'\subset\mathbb{P}^3$ such that $C\subset X'\neq X$. Thus

$$C\subset X\cap X',$$

and X and X' are irreducible, because C is contained neither in a quadric nor in a plane.

We see that $d\leqslant 9$. Hence, we have $g\leqslant 12$ by Theorem 2.17, which is a contradiction. □

4. PROJECTIVE SPACE

Let $\bar{G}\subset\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^3)$ be a subgroup such that $\bar{G}\cong\mathbb{A}_6$. There is a subgroup $\hat{G}\subset\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^3)$ such that

$$\bar{G}\subset\hat{G}\cong\mathbb{S}_6,$$

which implies that $\hat{G}\subseteq\mathrm{Aut}^{\bar{G}}(\mathbb{P}^3)$, because $\bar{G}$ is a normal subgroup of the group $\hat{G}$.

Remark 4.1. Let $\bar{G}_1\subset\bar{G}$ be a subgroup such that $\bar{G}_1\cong\mathbb{A}_5$ and the embedding

$$\mathbb{A}_5\cong\bar{G}_1\subset\bar{G}\cong\mathbb{A}_6$$

is standard (see Definition 3.1). Then there is a $\bar{G}_1$-invariant line $L_1\subset\mathbb{P}^3$ by Remark 3.5.

Thus, there are 12 lines L_1,L_2,L_3,L_4,L_5,L_6 and $L_1',L_2',L_3',L_4',L_5',L_6'$ in $\mathbb{P}^3$ such that

- the curves $\sum_{i=1}^6 L_i$ and $\sum_{i=1}^6 L_i'$ are $\bar{G}$-orbits of the lines L_1 and L_1', respectively.
- the lines L_1,L_2,L_3,L_4,L_5,L_6 and $L_1',L_2',L_3',L_4',L_5',L_6'$ are disjoint,
- for any 4 lines among L_1,L_2,L_3,L_4,L_5,L_6 there are 2 lines in $\mathbb{P}^3$ that intersect them,
- for any 4 lines among $L_1',L_2',L_3',L_4',L_5',L_6'$ there are 2 lines in $\mathbb{P}^3$ that intersect them,
- there are no lines in $\mathbb{P}^3$ that intersect 5 lines among L_1,L_2,L_3,L_4,L_5,L_6,
- there are no lines in $\mathbb{P}^3$ that intersect 5 lines among $L_1',L_2',L_3',L_4',L_5',L_6'$,
- the curve $\sum_{i=1}^6 L_i+\sum_{i=1}^6 L_i'$ is a $\hat{G}$-orbit of the line L_1.

Recall that a finite set of lines in $\mathbb{P}^3$ are said to lie in a linear complex if the corresponding points of the Grassmaniann $\mathrm{Gr}(2,4)\subset\mathbb{P}^5$ lie in a hyperplane section.

Lemma 4.2. Neither L_1,L_2,L_3,L_4,L_5,L_6 nor $L_1',L_2',L_3',L_4',L_5',L_6'$ lie in a linear complex.

Proof. It follows from Remark 3.4 that the space

$$\Lambda^2(V)\cong\mathbb{C}^6$$

is the permutation representation of the group $\bar{G}\cong\mathbb{A}_6$. The natural action of the group $\bar{G}$ on

$$\mathrm{Gr}\big(2,4\big)\subset\mathbb{P}^5\cong\mathbb{P}\Big(\Lambda^2(V)\Big)$$

arises from this representation. Let us identify $\bar{G}$ with a subgroup in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^5)$.

Note that there is a unique $\bar{G}$-invariant hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^5$. We may assume that the hyperplane H is given by $\sum_{i=0}^{5} x_i = 0$, the intersection $\mathrm{Gr}(2,4) \cap H$ is given by the equation

$$\sum_{i=0}^{5} x_i = \sum_{i=0}^{5} x_i^2 = 0 \subset \mathbb{P}^5 \cong \mathrm{Proj}\Big(\mathbb{C}\big[x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5\big]\Big).$$

Let $P \in \mathrm{Gr}(2,4)$ be a point that corresponds to the line $L_1 \subset \mathbb{P}^3$, and let $\bar{G}_1 \subset \bar{G}$ be the stabilizer of the point P. Then $\bar{G}_1 \cong \mathbb{A}_5$, and the embedding $\bar{G}_1 \subset \bar{G}$ is standard (cf. Remark 4.1).

Suppose that the $\bar{G}$-orbit of the point P is contained in a hyperplane. Then this hyperplane must be H. Thus, the $\bar{G}$-orbit of the point P must contain a point in $\mathbb{P}^5$ that is given by

$$x_0 = x_1 = x_2 = x_3 = x_4 = -\frac{x_5}{5},$$

which is impossible, because this point does not belong to the intersection $\mathrm{Gr}(2,4) \cap H$. □

Lemma 4.3. The equality $\mathrm{Aut}^{\bar{G}}(\mathbb{P}^3) = \hat{G}$ holds.

Proof. Put $\tilde{G} = \mathrm{Aut}^{\bar{G}}(\mathbb{P}^3)$. Then

- the curve $\sum_{i=1}^{6} L_i + \sum_{i=1}^{6} L_i'$ is $\tilde{G}$-invariant,
- the group $\bar{G}$ is a normal subgroup of the group $\tilde{G}$.

There is a subgroup $\breve{G} \subset \tilde{G}$ of index 2 such that $\sum_{i=1}^{6} L_i$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{6} L_i'$ are $\breve{G}$-invariant.

Let Y be the Hierholzer surface of the lines $L_1, L_2, L_3, L_4, L_5, L_6$ (see [38, Section 2.1]). Then

- the surface Y is $\breve{G}$-invariant and there exists a monomorphism $\xi\colon \breve{G} \to \mathrm{Aut}(Y)$,
- the surface Y is birational to a surface of general type (see [38, Theorem 2.1]),

which implies that $\breve{G}$ is a finite group (see [17]). Thus $\tilde{G}$ is a finite group. Hence, we have

$$\mathrm{lct}\Big(\mathbb{P}^3, \tilde{G}\Big) \geqslant \mathrm{lct}\Big(\mathbb{P}^3, \hat{G}\Big) \geqslant \mathrm{lct}\Big(\mathbb{P}^3, \bar{G}\Big) \geqslant \frac{6}{5},$$

by [9, Theorem 1.34]. There is a finite subgroup $G \subset \mathbb{SL}(4,\mathbb{C})$ such that

$$\tilde{G} = \phi(G) \subset \mathrm{Aut}\Big(\mathbb{P}^3\Big) \cong \mathbb{PGL}\Big(4, \mathbb{C}\Big),$$

where $\phi\colon \mathbb{SL}(4,\mathbb{C}) \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^3)$ is the natural projection.

Note that G may not be uniquely defined. However, by [9, Theorem 1.34], we may assume that one of the following possibilities hold:

- $G \cong 2.\mathbb{S}_6$, which is a central extension of the group $\mathbb{S}_6 \cong \tilde{G}$,
- $G \cong 2.\mathbb{A}_7$, which is a central extension of the group $\mathbb{A}_7 \cong \tilde{G}$,
- $G \cong \widetilde{\mathbb{O}}'(5,\mathbb{F}_3)$, which is a central extension of the group $\mathbb{O}'(5,\mathbb{F}_3)$ (see Theorem 1.6),
- G is one of the four groups described in [9, Example 1.30].

Note that $G \not\cong 2.\mathbb{A}_7$, because $\hat{G} \cong \mathbb{S}_6$ and $\mathbb{S}_6$ contains no subgroups isomorphic to $\mathbb{A}_7$.

Suppose that $\hat{G} \subsetneq \tilde{G}$. Then $G \not\cong 2.\mathbb{S}_6$.

Recall that $\bar{G}$ is a normal subgroup in $\tilde{G}$. Then $G \not\cong \widetilde{\mathbb{O}}'(5,\mathbb{F}_3)$, because $\mathbb{O}'(5,\mathbb{F}_3)$ is simple.

We see that G is one of the four groups described in [9, Example 1.30]. It follows from [29] that there is an exact sequence of groups

$$\begin{tikzcd} 1 \arrow[r] & \mathbb{Z}_2^4 \arrow[r, "\alpha"] & \tilde{G} \arrow[r, "\beta"] & \Gamma \arrow[r] & 1 \end{tikzcd},$$

where Γ is a subgroup of the group $\mathbb{S}_6$. Then $\Gamma = \mathbb{S}_6$ because $\hat{G} \cong \mathbb{S}_6$.

Let e be the identity element in $\tilde{G}$. Then

$$\bar{G} \cap \mathrm{im}\big(\alpha\big) = e,$$

because $\bar{G}$ is a simple group, and $\bar{G}$ is a normal subgroup of the group $\tilde{G}$. Hence

$$\breve{G} \supset \Big\langle \mathrm{im}(\alpha), \bar{G} \Big\rangle \cong \bar{G} \times \mathbb{Z}_2^4,$$

which easily leads to a contradiction (see [29]). □

Let us show that $\mathrm{Bir}^{\bar{G}}(\mathbb{P}^3) \neq \hat{G}$, which implies that $\mathbb{P}^3$ is not $\bar{G}$-birationally superrigid.

Lemma 4.4. There is a birational involution $\iota \in \mathrm{Bir}^{\bar{G}}(\mathbb{P}^3)$ such that

- the involution ι is not biregular,
- the linear system $\iota(|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)|)$ is a linear subsystem in $|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(19)|$, and
$$\mathrm{mult}_{L_i}\big(M\big) = 5$$
for every $i \in \{1,2,3,4,5,6\}$ and a general $M \in \iota(|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)|)$,
- the group generated by $\bar{G}$ and ι is isomorphic to $\mathbb{S}_6$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a linear subsystem of the linear system $|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(4)|$ consisting of surfaces that pass through the lines $L_1, L_2, L_3, L_4, L_5, L_6$. Then it follows from [37] and [38, Theorem 2.4] that

- the linear system $\mathcal{H}$ does not have fixed components,
- the linear system $\mathcal{H}$ induces a map $\psi\colon \mathbb{P}^3 \dashrightarrow V$, where V is a quartic threefold in $\mathbb{P}^4$.

Let $\alpha\colon U \to \mathbb{P}^3$ be a blow up along $L_1, L_2, L_3, L_4, L_5, L_6$. Then there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & U \arrow[dl, "\alpha"'] \arrow[dr, "\beta"] & \\
\mathbb{P}^3 \arrow[rr, dashed, "\phi"'] & & V,
\end{tikzcd}$$

where β is a birational morphism that contracts finitely many curves.

It follows from [38, Theorem 2.4] that $V \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ can be given by the equation

$$5\Big(yw - zt + xy + xw - xz - xt - x^2\Big)^2 - 20xyw\Big(w - x + y - z - t\Big)$$
$$\|$$
$$\Big(3x^2 + 2y^2 + 2z^2 + 2t^2 + 2w^2 - 3xy + 3xz + 3xt - 3xw - 2yz - 2yt + yw + zt - 2zw - 2tw\Big)^2$$

in appropriate homogeneous coordinates $[x : y : z : t : w]$ in $\mathbb{P}^4$. Using [37], we see that

- the singular locus of the threefold V consists of 36 nodes,
- the morphism β contracts the proper transforms of the following curves:
  - 30 lines in $\mathbb{P}^3$ each of whom intersects 4 lines among $L_1, L_2, L_3, L_4, L_5, L_6$,
  - 6 twisted cubics in $\mathbb{P}^3$ each of whom has the lines $L_1, L_2, L_3, L_4, L_5, L_6$ as chords.

Note that the quartic threefold $V \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ is determinantal (see [37], [30, Example 6.4.2]).

The map ϕ is $\bar{G}$-equivariant. We can identify $\bar{G}$ with a subgroup in $\mathrm{Aut}(V)$ and in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^4)$.

By Lemma 3.7, there are no $\bar{G}$-fixed points in $\mathbb{P}^4$. So, the action of the group $\bar{G}$ on $\mathbb{P}^4$ arises from its irreducible five-dimensional representation (cf. Remark 3.4). Hence, there is a subgroup

$$\bar{H} \subset \mathrm{Aut}\big(V\big)$$

such that $\bar{G} \subset \bar{H} \cong \mathbb{S}_6$. Let θ be an involution in $\bar{H}$ such that $\theta \notin \bar{G}$. Put

$$\iota = \phi^{-1} \circ \theta \circ \phi \in \mathrm{Bir}^{\bar{G}}\Big(\mathbb{P}^3\Big).$$

It follows from the construction of ι that $\langle \iota, \bar{G} \rangle \cong \mathbb{S}_6$.

Suppose that ι is biregular. Let us identify the subgroup $\langle \iota, \bar{G} \rangle$ with $\bar{H} \cong \mathbb{S}_6$. Then $\sum_{i=1}^{6} L_i$ must be $\bar{H}$-invariant. Let $\bar{G}_1 \subset \bar{G}$ and $\bar{H}_1 \subset \bar{H}$ be stabilizers of the line L_1. Then

$$\mathbb{A}_5 \cong \bar{G}_1 \subset \bar{H}_1 \cong \mathbb{S}_5,$$

and there are natural homomorphisms $\zeta\colon \bar{G}_1 \to \mathrm{Aut}(L_1)$ and $\eta\colon \bar{H}_1 \to \mathrm{Aut}(L_1)$. Thus, we have

$$\mathbb{A}_5 \cong \mathrm{im}\big(\zeta\big) \subseteq \mathrm{im}\big(\eta\big),$$

which gives $\mathrm{im}(\eta) \cong \mathbb{S}_5$. But $\mathrm{Aut}(L_1) \cong \mathbb{PGL}(2,\mathbb{C})$ contains no subgroups isomorphic to $\mathbb{S}_5$.

We see that the birational involution ι is not biregular.

Put $\tau = \beta^{-1} \circ \theta \circ \beta \in \mathrm{Bir}(U)$. Then τ is a composition of flops, and the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & U \arrow[rr, dashed, "\tau"] \arrow[ld, "\alpha"'] \arrow[rd, "\beta"] & & U \arrow[ld, "\theta\circ\beta"'] \arrow[rd, "\alpha"] & \\
\mathbb{P}^3 \arrow[rr, dashed, "\phi"'] & & V & & \mathbb{P}^3, \arrow[ll, dashed, "\phi\circ\iota"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

is a $\bar{G}$-equivariant Sarkisov link of type II (see [12, Definition 3.4]).

The involution τ is biregular outside of the curves contracted by β. Then τ naturally acts on the group $\mathrm{Pic}(U)$. Moreover, this action is nontrivial, because ι is not biregular.

Put $H = \alpha^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1))$. Let E_k be the α-exceptional divisor such that $\alpha(E_k) = L_k$. Then

$$\tau^*\big(H\big) \cdot \tau^*\big(H\big) \cdot \left(4H - \sum_{i=1}^{6} E_i\right) = 4,$$

because $\tau^*(K_U) \sim K_U$ and β contracts finitely many curves. Similarly, we see that

$$\tau^*\big(H\big) \cdot \tau^*\big(E_k\big) \cdot \left(4H - \sum_{i=1}^{6} E_i\right) = 1,\ \tau^*\big(E_i\big) \cdot \tau^*\big(E_k\big) \cdot \left(4H - \sum_{i=1}^{6} E_i\right) = \begin{cases} -2 \text{ if } i = k, \\ 0 \text{ if } i \neq k, \end{cases}$$

which immediately implies that

$$\begin{cases} \tau^*(H) \sim 19H - 5\displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{6} E_i, \\ \tau^*\big(E_k\big) \sim 12H - 4E_k - \displaystyle\sum_{i\neq k} 3E_i, \end{cases} \tag{4.5}$$

because the involution τ acts non-trivially on $\mathrm{Pic}(U)$. □

Lemma 4.6. There is a birational involution $\iota' \in \mathrm{Bir}^{\bar{G}}(\mathbb{P}^3)$ such that

- the involution ι' is not biregular,
- the linear system $\iota'(|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)|)$ is a linear subsystem in $|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(19)|$, and
  $$\mathrm{mult}_{L_i'}\big(M'\big) = 5$$
  for every $i \in \{1,2,3,4,5,6\}$ and a general $M' \in \iota'(|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)|)$,
- the group generated by $\bar{G}$ and ι' is isomorphic to $\mathbb{S}_6$.

Proof. We can put $\iota' = \nu \circ \iota \circ \nu^{-1}$ for any $\nu \in \hat{G} \cong \mathbb{S}_6$ such that $\nu \notin \bar{G}$. □

Note that the choice of ι and ι' is not unique. Put $\Gamma = \langle \iota, \iota', \hat{G} \rangle$.

Theorem 4.7. The variety $\mathbb{P}^3$ is $\bar{G}$-birationally rigid and $\mathrm{Bir}^{\bar{G}}(\mathbb{P}^3) = \Gamma$.

By [7, Corollary A.22], the assertion of Theorem 4.7 is implied by the following result.

Theorem 4.8. The subgroup $\Gamma \subset \mathrm{Bir}^{\bar{G}}(\mathbb{P}^3)$ untwists all $\bar{G}$-maximal singularities.

Before proving Theorem 4.8, let us use the proof of Theorem 4.8 to prove the following result.

Theorem 4.9. The group Γ is the free product of $\hat{G}$ and $\langle \iota, \bar{G} \rangle$ with amalgamated subgroup $\bar{G}$.

Proof. Let ξ be a birational automorphism in $\mathrm{Bir}^{\bar{G}}(\mathbb{P}^3)$ such that $\xi \notin \hat{G}$. Put

$$\mathcal{M}=\xi\Bigg(\Big|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)\Big|\Bigg),$$

and take $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $K_{\mathbb{P}^3}+\lambda\mathcal{M} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$. Then $(\mathbb{P}^3, \lambda\mathcal{M})$ is not canonical by [11, Theorem 4.2].

Let M be a general surface in $\mathcal{M}$. Then

$$\mathrm{mult}_{L_1}(M)=\ldots=\mathrm{mult}_{L_6}(M),$$

because $\sum_{i=1}^{6} L_i$ is $\bar{G}$-orbit of the line L_1. Similarly, we see that

$$\mathrm{mult}_{L_1'}(M)=\ldots=\mathrm{mult}_{L_6'}(M).$$

We claim that either $\mathrm{mult}_{L_1}(M) \leqslant 1/\lambda$ or $\mathrm{mult}_{L_1'}(M) \leqslant 1/\lambda$. Indeed, suppose that

$$\min\Big(\mathrm{mult}_{L_1}(M), \mathrm{mult}_{L_1'}(M)\Big) > \frac{1}{\lambda},$$

and let Π be a general plane in $\mathbb{P}^3$ that contains the line L_1. Put

$$\mathcal{M}\Big|_{\Pi}=\mathrm{mult}_{L_1}(M)L_1+\mathcal{B}\equiv\frac{4}{\lambda}\Pi\Big|_{\Pi},$$

where $\mathcal{B}$ is a mobile linear system on Π. Let B_1 and B_2 be general curves in $\mathcal{B}$. Then

$$\mathrm{mult}_{O_2}(B_1)=\ldots=\mathrm{mult}_{O_6}(B_1)=\mathrm{mult}_{O_2}(B_2)=\ldots=\mathrm{mult}_{O_6}(B_2)=\mathrm{mult}_{L_1}(M),$$

where $O_i=\Pi\cap L_i$ for $i\in\{2,\ldots,6\}$. Similarly, we see that

$$\mathrm{mult}_{O_1'}(B_1)=\ldots=\mathrm{mult}_{O_6'}(B_1)=\mathrm{mult}_{O_1'}(B_2)=\ldots=\mathrm{mult}_{O_6'}(B_2)=\mathrm{mult}_{L_1'}(M),$$

where $O_i'=\Pi\cap L_i'$ for $i\in\{1,\ldots,6\}$. Then

$$B_1\cdot B_2\geqslant\sum_{i=2}^{6}\mathrm{mult}_{O_i}(B_1)\mathrm{mult}_{O_i}(B_2)+\sum_{i=1}^{6}\mathrm{mult}_{O_i'}(B_1)\mathrm{mult}_{O_i'}(B_2)>\frac{11}{\lambda^2},$$

because $\mathrm{mult}_{L_1}(M) > 1/\lambda$ and $\mathrm{mult}_{L_1'}(M) > 1/\lambda$. On the other hand, we have

$$B_1\cdot B_2=\left(\frac{4}{\lambda}\Pi\Big|_{\Pi}-\mathrm{mult}_{L_1}(M)L_1\right)^2=\left(\frac{4}{\lambda}-\mathrm{mult}_{L_1}(M)L_1\right)^2<\frac{9}{\lambda^2},$$

which is a contradiction. Thus, we see that $\mathrm{mult}_{L_1}(M) \leqslant 1/\lambda$ or $\mathrm{mult}_{L_1'}(M) \leqslant 1/\lambda$.

If the inequality $\mathrm{mult}_{L_1}(M) > 1/\lambda$ holds, then it follows from (4.5) that

$$\iota(\mathcal{M})\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}\frac{1}{\delta}\Big(-K_{\mathbb{P}^3}\Big)$$

for some $\delta \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\delta < \lambda$. Similarly, if the inequality $\mathrm{mult}_{L_1'}(M) > 1/\lambda$ holds, then

$$\iota'(\mathcal{M})\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}\frac{1}{\delta'}\Big(-K_{\mathbb{P}^3}\Big)$$

for some $\delta' \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\delta' < \lambda$ (cf. the proof of [7, Lemma B.15]).

Therefore, there is a uniquely defined $\zeta \in \mathrm{Bir}^{\bar{G}}(\mathbb{P}^3)$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$\zeta=\underbrace{\ldots\circ\iota\circ\iota'\circ\iota\circ\iota'\circ\iota\circ\ldots}_{m\ \text{times}},$$

the equivalence $K_{\mathbb{P}^3}+\gamma\zeta(\mathcal{M})\sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$ holds, and

$$\max\Big(\mathrm{mult}_{L_1}\big(\zeta(M)\big), \mathrm{mult}_{L_1'}\big(\zeta(M)\big)\Big)\leqslant\frac{1}{\gamma}.$$

Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 4.8, we see that $(\mathbb{P}^3, \gamma\zeta(\mathcal{M}))$ is canonical. Hence

$$\zeta \circ \xi \in \hat{G} \cong \mathbb{S}_6$$

by [11, Theorem 4.2]. On the other hand, one has

$$\iota' = \nu \circ \iota \circ \nu^{-1}$$

for some $\nu \in \hat{G} \setminus \bar{G}$ by construction of ι' (see the proof of Lemma 4.6).

Without loss of generality we may assume that ν is an involution.

We see that every $\alpha \in \mathrm{Bir}^{\bar{G}}(\mathbb{P}^3)$ can be uniquely written as

$$\alpha = \beta \circ \left(\underbrace{\iota \circ \nu \circ \iota \circ \nu \circ \iota \circ \nu \circ \iota \circ \nu \circ \iota \circ \ldots}_{r \text{ times}} \right)$$

for some $\beta \in \hat{G}$ such that $r = 0$ if and only if $\alpha \in \hat{G}$. The latter easily implies that Γ is the free product of the groups $\hat{G} \cong \mathbb{S}_6$ and $\langle \iota, \bar{G} \rangle \cong \mathbb{S}_6$ with amalgamated subgroup $\bar{G} \cong \mathbb{A}_6$. ☐

Remark 4.10. Note that $\hat{G} \not\subset \langle \iota, \iota', \bar{G} \rangle$ (see the proof of Theorem 4.9).

In the rest of this section, we prove Theorem 4.8 (cf. the proof of [9, Theorem B.17]).

Suppose that Γ does not untwists all $\bar{G}$-maximal singularities. Let us derive a contradiction.

Lemma 4.11. There is linear system $\mathcal{H}$ on $\mathbb{P}^3$ such that

- the linear system $\mathcal{H}$ is $\bar{G}$-invariant,
- the linear system $\mathcal{H}$ does not have fixed components,
- the singularities of the log pair

$$\Big(\mathbb{P}^3, \lambda_\tau \tau\big(\mathcal{H}\big)\Big)$$

  are not canonical for every $\tau \in \Gamma$, where $\lambda_\tau \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$K_{\mathbb{P}^3} + \lambda_\tau \tau\big(\mathcal{H}\big) \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0.$$

Proof. The required assertion follows from [7, Definition A.21] (cf. [11, Theorem 4.2]). ☐

Note that $3/\lambda_\tau \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ for any element $\tau \in \Gamma$. Thus, there is $\epsilon \in \Gamma$ such that λ_ϵ is as large as possible. Put $\mathcal{M} = \epsilon(\mathcal{H})$ and $\lambda = \lambda_\epsilon$. Then $(\mathbb{P}^3, \lambda\mathcal{M})$ is not canonical by Lemma 4.11.

Lemma 4.12. Let M be a general surface in $\mathcal{M}$. Then

$$\frac{1}{\lambda} \geqslant \max\Big(\mathrm{mult}_{L_i}\big(M\big), \mathrm{mult}_{L_i'}\big(M\big)\Big)$$

for every $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$.

Proof. The inequalities follow from the minimality of λ_ϵ (cf. the proof of Theorem 4.9). ☐

Let us show that the log pair $(\mathbb{P}^3, \lambda\mathcal{M})$ is canonical. Suppose that is not.

Remark 4.13. There is $\mu \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\mu < 2\lambda$ and $(\mathbb{P}^3, \mu\mathcal{M})$ is strictly log canonical.

Let $S \subset X$ be a minimal center in $\mathbb{LCS}(\mathbb{P}^3, \mu\mathcal{M})$.

Lemma 4.14. The center S is not a surface.

Proof. The linear system $\mathcal{M}$ has no fixed components. ☐

Put $H=\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1)$. By Lemma 2.10, there is $\delta\in\mathbb{Q}$ and there is a $\bar{G}$-invariant effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor

$$D\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}\delta H$$

on the threefold $\mathbb{P}^3$ such that $0<\delta<8$, the log pair $(\mathbb{P}^3, D)$ is log canonical and

$$\mathbb{LCS}\Big(\mathbb{P}^3, D\Big)=\bigcup_{g\in\bar{G}}\Big\{g(S)\Big\}.$$

Remark 4.15. It follows from Lemma 4.12 and the proof of Lemma 2.10 that we may assume that

$$2>\max\Big(\mathrm{mult}_{L_i}(D),\mathrm{mult}_{L_i'}(D)\Big)$$

for every $i\in\{1,2,3,4,5,6\}$.

Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the multiplier ideal sheaf of the log pair $(\mathbb{P}^3, D)$, and let $\mathcal{L}$ be the log canonical singularities subscheme of the log pair $(\mathbb{P}^3, D)$. Then it follows from Theorem 2.1 that

$$h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{L}}\otimes\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(4H)\Big)=h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(4H)\Big)-h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(4H)\otimes\mathcal{I}\Big)=35-h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(4H)\otimes\mathcal{I}\Big). \tag{4.16}$$

Lemma 4.17. The center S is a curve.

Proof. If S is a point, then $|\mathrm{LCS}(\mathbb{P}^3, D)|\leqslant 35$ by (4.16), which contradicts Lemma 3.8. ☐

By Theorem 2.6, the curve S is a smooth curve in $\mathbb{P}^3$ of degree d and genus $g\leqslant 2d$. Put

$$q=h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(4H)\otimes\mathcal{I}\Big),$$

let Z be the $\bar{G}$-orbit of the curve S, let r be the number of irreducible components of Z. Then

- the equality $Z=\mathcal{L}$ holds, because $(\mathbb{P}^3, D)$ is log canonical,
- the curve Z is smooth by Lemma 2.5,
- the curve $Z\subset\mathbb{P}^3$ is not contained in a plane by Remark 3.4.

Lemma 4.18. The equality $r(4d-g+1)=35-q$ holds.

Proof. The equality follows from (4.16) and the Riemann–Roch theorem, because $2d\geqslant g$. ☐

Corollary 4.19. The inequality $g\leqslant 34$ holds.

Lemma 4.20. Suppose that $1\leqslant q\leqslant 7$. Then $q\in\{5,6\}$.

Proof. The center of G acts trivially on polynomials of even degree. Hence, the space

$$W=H^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(4H)\otimes\mathcal{I}\Big),$$

has a natural structure of a $\bar{G}$-representation. Suppose that $q\not\in\{5,6\}$. Then W has a trivial subrepresentation of the group $\bar{G}$ (see [13]), which is impossible by Lemma 3.7. ☐

Lemma 4.21. Suppose that $r\neq 1$. Then $r=6$ and $d=1$.

Proof. Since $r\leqslant 35$ by Lemma 4.18, one has

$$r\in\Big\{6,10,15,20,30\Big\}$$

by Lemma 3.3. In particular, the inequality $q\geqslant 1$ holds by Lemma 4.18.

Suppose that $q\geqslant 6$. Then $r(4d-g+1)<30$ by Lemma 4.18. We see that

$$g+1\leqslant 4d-g+1<5,$$

which implies that $g\leqslant 3$. Then $d=1$ and $g=0$, which leads to a contradiction.

By Lemma 4.20 we may assume that $q=5$. Then $r\in\{6,10,15,30\}$ by Lemma 4.18.

If $r=30$, then $g+1\leqslant 4d-g+1=1$ by Lemma 4.18, which is a contradiction.

If $r=15$, then $g+1\leqslant 4d-g+1=2$ by Lemma 4.18, which leads to a contradiction..

If $r=10$, then $g+1\leqslant 4d-g+1=3$ by Lemma 4.18, which leads to a contradiction.

If $r=6$, then $g+1\leqslant 4d-g+1=5$ by Lemma 4.18, which gives $g=0$ and $d=1$. ☐

Lemma 4.22. The equality $r = 1$ holds.

Proof. Suppose that $r \neq 1$. Then Z is a disjoint union of 6 lines by Lemma 4.21, which implies that either $Z = L_1 + L_2 + L_3 + L_4 + L_5 + L_6$, or $Z = L_1' + L_2' + L_3' + L_4' + L_5' + L_6'$.

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $S = L_1$ and $Z = L_1 + L_2 + L_3 + L_4 + L_5 + L_6$. Let $\bar{F} \subset \bar{G}$ be the stabilizer of L_1. Then $\bar{F} \cong \mathbb{A}_5$. Let $\pi\colon U \to \mathbb{P}^3$ be the blow up of L_1. Then

$$K_U + \bar{D} + \Big(\mathrm{mult}_{L_1}\big(D\big) - 1\Big)E \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} \pi^*\Big(K_{\mathbb{P}^3} + D\Big),$$

where E is the π-exceptional divisor, and $\bar{D}$ is the proper transform of D on U. One has

$$2 > \mathrm{mult}_{L_1}\big(D\big) > 1$$

by Remark 4.15. The group $\bar{F}$ naturally acts on E so that the divisor $\bar{D}|_E$ is $\bar{F}$-invariant.

We can identify the surface E with a smooth quadric in $\mathbb{P}^3$. The action of the group $\bar{F}$ extends to the ambient space $\mathbb{P}^3$. Note that this action arises from the standard four-dimensional representation of the group $\bar{F} \cong \mathbb{A}_5$.

It follows from the inequality $\mathrm{mult}_{L_1}(D) < 2$ that the set

$$\mathbb{LCS}\left(U, \bar{D} + \Big(\mathrm{mult}_{L_1}\big(D\big) - 1\Big)E\right)$$

contains an irreducible reduced curve $C \subset E$ such that $\pi(C) = L_1$. One has

$$C \in \mathbb{LCS}\left(E, \bar{D}\Big|_E\right)$$

by Theorem 2.4, which is impossible by Lemma 2.14. $\square$

We see that $Z = S$.

Lemma 4.23. The inequality $g \neq 31$ holds.

Proof. Suppose that $g = 31$. Then it follows from Lemma 4.18 that

$$d = \frac{65 - q}{4},$$

which gives $q > 0$. Hence $q \geqslant 5$ by Lemma 4.20. We have $g/2 \leqslant d \leqslant 15$, which is impossible. $\square$

Lemma 4.24. The inequality $g \neq 25$ holds.

Proof. Suppose that $g = 25$. Then it follows from Lemma 4.18 that

$$d = \frac{59 - q}{4},$$

which gives $q > 0$. Hence $q \geqslant 11$ by Lemma 4.20. We have $g/2 \leqslant d \leqslant 12$, which is impossible. $\square$

Lemma 4.25. The inequality $g \neq 19$ holds.

Proof. Suppose that $g = 19$. Then S is not contained in a cubic surface by Lemma 3.9. We have

$$h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}\big(3\big) \otimes \mathcal{O}_S\Big) \geqslant h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}\big(3\big)\Big) = 20,$$

because there is an exact sequence of the cohomology groups.

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}\big(3\big) \otimes \mathcal{I}\Big) \longrightarrow H^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}\big(3\big)\Big) \longrightarrow H^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}\big(3\big) \otimes \mathcal{O}_S\Big).$$

By the Riemann–Roch theorem, we have

$$20 \leqslant h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}\big(3\big) \otimes \mathcal{O}_S\Big) = 3d - g + 1 + h^1\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}\big(3\big) \otimes \mathcal{O}_S\Big) = 3d - 18 + h^1\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}\big(3\big) \otimes \mathcal{O}_S\Big),$$

which implies that $h^1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3)\otimes\mathcal{O}_S)\neq 0$, because $d\leqslant 12$ by Lemma 4.18. Then

$$19\geqslant\frac{3d}{2}+1\geqslant h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3)\otimes\mathcal{O}_S\Big)\geqslant 20$$

by Theorem 2.16. □

Lemma 4.26. The inequality $g\neq 16$ holds.

Proof. Suppose that $g=16$. Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 4.25, we see that

$$18\geqslant\frac{3d}{2}+1\geqslant h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3)\otimes\mathcal{O}_S\Big)\geqslant 20$$

by Theorem 2.16, because $d\leqslant 11$ by Lemma 4.18. □

Therefore, we see that $g=10$. Then $d\geqslant 9$ by Theorem 2.17.

Lemma 4.27. The inequality $d\neq 9$ holds.

Proof. Suppose that $d=9$. It follows from Lemma 3.7 that

$$h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2)\otimes\mathcal{I}\Big)\neq 1,$$

which implies that $S=F_1\cap F_2$, where F_1 and F_2 are cubic surfaces in $\mathbb{P}^3$ (see [16, Example 6.4.3])

The group $\bar{G}$ cannot act non-trivially on the pencil generated by F_1 and F_2, which implies that the surfaces F_1 and F_2 must be $\bar{G}$-invariant. The latter is impossible by Lemma 3.7. □

Lemma 4.28. The inequality $d\neq 10$ holds.

Proof. Suppose that $d=10$. Then $q=4$ by Lemma 4.18, which is impossible by Lemma 4.20. □

Thus we see that $d\geqslant 11$. Then $q=0$ and $d=11$ by Lemma 4.18.

Take a subgroup $\bar{F}\subset\bar{G}$ such that $\bar{F}\cong\mathbb{A}_5$ and the embedding $\bar{F}\subset\bar{G}$ is non-standard (see Definition 3.1). Then there is an $\bar{F}$-invariant twisted cubic curve $C\subset\mathbb{P}^3$ by Lemma 3.6.

Let R be the quartic surface in $\mathbb{P}^3$ that is swept out by the lines that are tangent to C. Then

- the surface R is $\bar{F}$-invariant,
- the curve S is not contained in the surface R, because $q=0$.

Put $\Sigma=R\cap S$. We have $\Sigma=\Sigma_1\cup\ldots\cup\Sigma_r$, where Σ_i is a $\bar{F}$-orbit. Hence, we have

$$44=R\cdot S=\sum_{i=1}^{r}a_i\big|\Sigma_i\big|$$

for some positive integers $a_1,\ldots,a_r$. We may assume that $|\Sigma_1|\geqslant\ldots\geqslant|\Sigma_r|$. But

$$\big|\Sigma_i\big|\in\big\{12,20,30,60\big\}$$

for every $i\in\{1,\ldots,r\}$ by Lemma 2.7. Thus, we see that $|\Sigma_1|=20$.

Let $O\in\Sigma_1$ be a point, and let $\bar{F}_O\subset\bar{F}$ be the stabilizer of the point O. Then $\bar{F}_O\cong\mathbb{Z}_3$.

Let Γ be the $\bar{G}$-orbit of the point O, and let $\bar{G}_O\subset\bar{G}$ be the stabilizer of the point O. Then

- the order of the group $\bar{G}_O$ must divide 18,
- the group $\bar{G}_O$ is cyclic by Lemma 2.7,

which implies that $\bar{G}_O\cong\mathbb{Z}_3$. Hence, we see that $|\Gamma|=120$, which contradicts Lemma 2.8.

The obtained contradiction completes the proof of Theorem 4.8.

5. Segre cubic

Let $G \subset \mathbb{SL}(5,\mathbb{C})$ be a subgroup such that $G \cong \mathbb{A}_6$. Put $W = \mathbb{C}^5$ and

$$\bar{G} = \phi(G) \subset \mathrm{Aut}\Big(\mathbb{P}^4\Big) \cong \mathbb{PGL}\Big(5, \mathbb{C}\Big),$$

where $\phi\colon \mathbb{SL}(5,\mathbb{C}) \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^4)$ is the natural projection. Then

- the space W is an irreducible representation of the group $G \cong \bar{G} \cong \mathbb{A}_6$,
- there is unique cubic hypersurface $X \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ that is $\bar{G}$-invariant.

Let us identify X with a smooth complete intersection in $\mathbb{P}^5$ that is given by the equation

$$\sum_{i=0}^{5} x_i = \sum_{i=0}^{5} x_i^3 = 0 \subset \mathbb{P}^5 \cong \mathrm{Proj}\Big(\mathbb{C}\big[x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5\big]\Big),$$

and let us identify $\bar{G}$ with a subgroup of the group $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ (cf. Example 1.15).

Let $O \in X$ be a point, and let $\bar{F} \subset \bar{G}$ be its stabilizer.

Remark 5.1. Let $\tilde{T}$ be the affine tangent space to $\mathbb{P}^4$ at the point $O \in \mathbb{P}^4$. Then $\bar{F}$ naturally acts on the space $\tilde{T}$. Let us consider W as a representation of the group $\bar{F}$. One has

$$\tilde{T} \cong W/W_O \otimes W_O^*,$$

where W_O is the one-dimensional subrepresentation of $\bar{F}$ that corresponds to the point $O \in \mathbb{P}^4$.

Let Σ be the $\bar{G}$-orbit of the point $O \in X$.

Lemma 5.2. Suppose that $|\Sigma| \leqslant 15$. Then $|\Sigma| \in \{10, 15\}$.

Proof. One has $|\Sigma| \neq 1$, because W is an irreducible representation of the group $\bar{G}$. Hence

$$\big|\Sigma\big| \in \big\{6, 10, 15\big\}$$

by Lemma 3.3. Suppose that $|\Sigma| = 6$. Then $\bar{F} \cong \mathbb{A}_5$ by Lemma 3.3.

Let us consider W as a representation of the group $\bar{F}$. Then W is reducible and

$$W \cong W_t \oplus W_4,$$

where W_t and W_4 are the trivial and a four-dimensional representations of the group $\bar{F}$, respectively. The embedding $\bar{F} \subset \bar{G}$ is standard (see Definition 3.1), because W is reducible.

Note that W_t is the only one-dimensional subrepresentation of the representation W, because the representation W_4 is irreducible. Hence, the set Σ must contain a point in $\mathbb{P}^5$ that is given by

$$x_0 = x_1 = x_2 = x_3 = x_4 = -\frac{x_5}{5},$$

which is impossible, because this point does not belong to the hypersurface $X \subset \mathbb{P}^5$. □

Let T be the affine tangent space to X at the point O. Then $\bar{F}$ naturally acts on T.

Lemma 5.3. Suppose that $|\Sigma| = 10$. Then $\Sigma = \mathrm{Sing}(X)$ and

$$\bar{F} \cong \Big(\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3\Big) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_4.$$

Moreover, T is an irreducible four-dimensional representation of the group $\bar{F}$.

Proof. One has $\bar{F} \cong (\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_4$ by Lemma 3.3.

Up to conjugation, the group $\bar{G}$ has a unique subgroup that is isomorphic to $\bar{F}$, which implies that we may assume that $\bar{F}$ fixes the point $[1 : -1 : 1 : -1 : 1 : -1] \in \mathrm{Sing}(X)$.

Let us consider W as a representation of the group $\bar{F}$, and let $W_1 \subset W$ be the one-dimensional subrepresentation of the group $\bar{G}$ that corresponds to the point $[1 : -1 : 1 : -1 : 1 : -1]$. Then

$$W \cong W_1 \oplus W_4,$$

where W_4 is some four-dimensional representation of the group $\bar{F}$.

Let χ_1 and χ be the characters of the representations W_1 and W, respectively. The values of the characters χ_1 and χ and the structure of the subgroup $\bar{F}$ are given in the following table:

	$[4,2]$	$[3,3]$	$[3,1,1,1]$	$[2,2,1,1]$	e
$\#$	18	4	4	9	1
χ	-1	-1	2	1	5
χ_1	-1	1	1	1	1

where we use notation similar to the ones used in the proof of Lemma 3.7.

We see that W_4 is an irreducible representation of the group $\bar{F}$. Thus, without loss of generality, we may assume that $O = [1 : -1 : 1 : -1 : 1 : -1]$. Then

$$T \cong W_4 \otimes W_1^*$$

by Remark 5.1, which implies that T is an irreducible representation of the group $\bar{F}$. $\square$

Let Γ be the $\bar{G}$-orbit of the point $[0 : 0 : 0 : 0 : 1 : -1] \in X \setminus \mathrm{Sing}(X)$. Then $|\Gamma| = 15$.

Lemma 5.4. Suppose that $|\Sigma| = 15$. Then $\Sigma = \Gamma$, and $\bar{F} \cong \mathbb{S}_4$. Moreover, T is an irreducible three-dimensional representation of the group $\bar{F}$.

Proof. One has $\bar{F} \cong \mathbb{S}_4$ by Lemma 3.3. Up to conjugation, the group $\bar{G}$ contains exactly two non-conjugate subgroups that are isomorphic to the group $\bar{F} \cong \mathbb{S}_4$ (see Lemma 3.3).

Let us consider W as a representation of the group $\bar{F}$. Then W contains some one-dimensional subrepresentation U of the group $\bar{F}$ that correspond to the point $O \in X$.

Let W_t be the trivial one-dimensional representations of the group $\bar{F}$, and let W_1 be the non-trivial one-dimensional representations of the group $\bar{F}$. Then either $U \cong W_t$ or $U \cong W_1$.

Let χ and χ_1 be the characters of W and W_1, respectively.

Suppose that $\mathbb{S}_4 \cong \bar{F} \subset \bar{G} \cong \mathbb{A}_6$ is a non-standard embedding. The values of χ_1 and χ and the structure of the subgroup $\bar{F}$ are given in the following table:

	$[4,2]$	$[3,3]$	$[2,2,1,1]$	$[2,2,1,1]$	e
$\#$	6	8	3	6	1
χ	-1	-1	1	1	5
χ_1	-1	1	1	-1	1

where we use notation similar to the ones used in the proof of Lemma 3.7, and we divide the elements of type $[2,2,1,1]$ that are contained in the subgroup $\bar{F}$ into two classes with respect to the values of the character χ_1. We see that W contains no one-dimensional subrepresentations.

Thus $\mathbb{S}_4 \cong \bar{F} \subset \bar{G} \cong \mathbb{A}_6$ is a standard embedding. The values of χ_1 and χ and the structure of the subgroup $\bar{F}$ are given in the following table:

	$[4,2]$	$[3,1,1,1]$	$[2,2,1,1]$	$[2,2,1,1]$	e
$\#$	6	8	3	6	1
χ	-1	2	1	1	5
χ_1	-1	1	1	-1	1

which implies that $W \cong W_t \oplus W_1 \oplus W_3$, where W_3 is an irreducible three-dimensional representation of the group $\bar{F}$. Hence T is an irreducible representation of the group $\bar{F}$ by Remark 5.1.

Suppose that $\Sigma \neq \Gamma$. Then $[1 : 1 : 1 : 1 : -2 : -2] \in \Sigma$. But $[1 : 1 : 1 : 1 : -2 : -2] \notin X$, which gives a contradiction. $\square$

Let H be a general hyperplane section of the cubic $X \subset \mathbb{P}^4$.

Remark 5.5. The $\bar{G}$-invariant subgroup of the group $\mathrm{Cl}(X)$ is generated by $H \in \mathrm{Cl}(X)$.

The main purpose of this section is to prove the following result (cf. [7, Lemma B.15]).

Theorem 5.6. The threefold X is $\bar{G}$-birationally superrigid.

Suppose that X is not $\bar{G}$-birationally superrigid. Let us derive a contradiction.

Lemma 5.7. There is linear system $\mathcal{M}$ on X such that

- the linear system $\mathcal{M}$ is $\bar{G}$-invariant,
- the linear system $\mathcal{M}$ does not have fixed components,
- the log pair $(X, \lambda\mathcal{M})$ is not canonical, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$K_X + \lambda\mathcal{M} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0.$$

Proof. See [11, Theorem 4.2], [5, Theorem 1.4.1], [7, Corollary A.22]. ☐

Lemma 5.8. There is $\mu \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\mu < 2\lambda$ and $(X, \mu\mathcal{M})$ is strictly log canonical.

Proof. The required assertion is obvious if $(X, \lambda\mathcal{M})$ is not canonical outside of the set $\mathrm{Sing}(X)$, which implies that we may assume that $(X, \lambda\mathcal{M})$ is canonical outside of the set $\mathrm{Sing}(X)$.

The log pair $(X, \lambda\mathcal{M})$ is not canonical at some point $P \in \mathrm{Sing}(X)$.

Let $\pi\colon U \to X$ be a blow up of the point P, and let E be the π-exceptional divisor. Then

$$\bar{\mathcal{M}} \sim \pi^*\big(\mathcal{M}\big) - mE,$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ is the proper transforms of the linear system $\mathcal{M}$ on the variety U, and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then

$$m > \frac{1}{\lambda}$$

by [5, Theorem 1.7.20]. Thus, the log pair $(X, 2\lambda\mathcal{M})$ is not log canonical at the point P. ☐

Let $S \subset X$ be a minimal center in $\mathbb{LCS}(X, \mu\mathcal{M})$. Then it follows from Lemma 2.5 that

$$g\big(S\big) \cap g'\big(S\big) \neq \varnothing \iff g\big(S\big) = g'\big(S\big)$$

for every $g \in \bar{G} \ni g'$.

Lemma 5.9. The center S is not a surface.

Proof. The linear system $\mathcal{M}$ has no fixed components. ☐

By Lemma 2.10, there is a $\bar{G}$-invariant effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D on X such that

$$\mathbb{LCS}\Big(X, D\Big) = \bigcup_{g \in \bar{G}} \Big\{g\big(S\big)\Big\},$$

the log pair (X, D) is log canonical and $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -\delta K_X$ for some $\delta \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $0 < \delta < 2$.

Remark 5.10. Arguing as in the proof of [9, Lemma 2.11], we see that we can replace D by

$$\big(\mu - \epsilon\big)\mathcal{M} + \epsilon'\mathcal{H},$$

where $\epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0} \ni \epsilon'$ such that $\epsilon \ll 1$ and $\epsilon' \ll 1$, and $\mathcal{H}$ is a $\bar{G}$-invariant linear system such that

- the equivalence $\mathcal{H} \sim -nK_X$ holds for some $n \gg 0$ and

$$\delta = \frac{\mu - \epsilon}{\lambda} + \epsilon' n,$$

- the base locus of the linear system $\mathcal{H}$ coincides with $\mathbb{LCS}(X, D)$,

which implies that, without loss of generality, we can replace D by $\mu\mathcal{M}$ (cf. Lemma 2.10).

Therefore, without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$\mathbb{LCS}\Big(X,\mu\mathcal{M}\Big)=\bigcup_{g\in\bar{G}}\Big\{g(S)\Big\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the multiplier ideal sheaf of $(X,\mu\mathcal{M})$, and let $\mathcal{L}$ be the subscheme given by $\mathcal{I}$. Then

$$h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{L}}\otimes\mathcal{O}_X\big(2H\big)\Big)=h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_X\big(2H\big)\Big)-h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_X\big(2H\big)\otimes\mathcal{I}\Big)=15-h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_X\big(2H\big)\otimes\mathcal{I}\Big) \tag{5.11}$$

by Theorem 2.1.

Lemma 5.12. The center S is not a singular point of the threefold X.

Proof. Suppose that S is a singular point of the threefold X. Then

$$\mathrm{LCS}\Big(X,\mu\mathcal{M}\Big)=\mathrm{Sing}\big(X\big),$$

because $\bar{G}$ acts transitively on the set $\mathrm{Sing}(X)$. Recall that $|\mathrm{Sing}(X)|=10$.

Let $\bar{F}\subset\bar{G}$ be a stabilizer of the point S. Then $\bar{F}\cong(\mathbb{Z}_3\times\mathbb{Z}_3)\rtimes\mathbb{Z}_4$ by Lemma 5.3.

Let $\pi\colon U\to X$ be a blow up of the points $\mathrm{Sing}(X)$, and let $E_1,\ldots,E_{10}$ be the π-exceptional divisors. Then there is a positive rational number m such that

$$K_U+\mu\bar{\mathcal{M}}+\big(m-1\big)\sum_{i=1}^{10}E_i\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}\pi^*\Big(K_X+\mu\mathcal{M}\Big),$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ is the proper transforms of the linear system $\mathcal{M}$ on the variety U.

Note that it follows from [5, Theorem 1.7.20] that $m\geqslant 1$ (cf. [12, Theorem 3.10]).

We may assume that $\pi(E_1)=S$. There is a natural homomorphism $\upsilon\colon\bar{F}\to\mathrm{Aut}(E_1)$. Then

$$\mathrm{lct}\Big(E_1,\upsilon\big(\bar{F}\big)\Big)\geqslant 1$$

by Lemmas 2.13 and 5.3, because $E_1\cong\mathbb{P}^1\times\mathbb{P}^1$.

Let us show that $\mathrm{lct}(E_1,\upsilon(\bar{F}))<1$ to derive a contradiction.

One can easily check that there exists a two-dimensional linear subspace $\Pi\subset\mathbb{P}^4$ such that

$$\Big|\Pi\cap\mathrm{Sing}\big(X\big)\Big|=4$$

and $\Pi\subset X$ (see [18, Section 3.2]). Let C be a general conic in Π that contains $\Pi\cap\mathrm{Sing}(X)$. Then

$$C\not\subset\mathrm{Bs}\big(\mathcal{M}\big),$$

and C is irreducible. Let $\bar{C}$ be a proper transform of the curve C on the threefold U. Then

$$\frac{8}{\mu}-4\frac{m}{\mu}>\frac{4}{\lambda}-4\frac{m}{\mu}=\bar{\mathcal{M}}\cdot\bar{C}\geqslant 0,$$

which implies that $m<2$. In particular, the singularities of the log pair

$$\left(U,\ \mu\bar{\mathcal{M}}+\big(m-1\big)\sum_{i=1}^{10}E_i\right)$$

are not Kawamata log terminal along E_1. Hence $\mathrm{lct}(E_1,\upsilon(\bar{F}))<1$ by Theorem 2.4. □

Lemma 5.13. The center S is a curve.

Proof. Suppose that S is a point. Then $S\not\in\mathrm{Sing}(X)$ by Lemma 5.13. It follows from (5.11) that

$$\Big|\mathrm{LCS}\Big(X,\mu\mathcal{M}\Big)\Big|\leqslant 15,$$

which implies that $\mathrm{LCS}(X,\mu\mathcal{M})$ the $\bar{G}$-orbit of the point $[0:0:0:0:1:-1]$ by Lemma 5.2.

There are 15 two-dimensional linear subspaces $\Pi_1,\ldots,\Pi_{15}$ in $\mathbb{P}^4$ such that

$$\Big|\Pi_i\cap\mathrm{LCS}\Big(X,\mu\mathcal{M}\Big)\Big|=6$$

and $X\cap\Pi_i=L_i^1+L_i^2+L_i^3$ for any $i\in\{1,\ldots,15\}$, where L_i^j is a line such that

$$\Bigg(\Big(L_i^1\cap L_i^2\Big)\cup\Big(L_i^1\cap L_i^3\Big)\cup\Big(L_i^2\cap L_i^3\Big)\Bigg)\bigcap\mathrm{LCS}\Big(X,\mu\mathcal{M}\Big)=\varnothing$$

and $L_i^j=L_r^s$ if and only if $(i,j)=(r,s)$. Note that the curve

$$\sum_{i=1}^{15}\Big(L_i^1+L_i^2+L_i^3\Big)$$

is a $\bar{G}$-orbit of the line L_1^1. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $S\in L_1^1$.

Let M_1 and M_2 be general surfaces in the linear system $\mathcal{M}$. Put

$$M_1\cdot M_2=\gamma\sum_{i=1}^{15}\Big(L_i^1+L_i^2+L_i^3\Big)+\Omega,$$

where Ω is an effective cycle such that $L_i^j\not\subseteq\mathrm{Supp}(\Omega)$ for every $i\in\{1,\ldots,15\}$ and $j\in\{1,2,3\}$, and γ is a non-negative rational number. Put

$$m=\mathrm{mult}_S\Big(M_1\cdot M_2\Big),$$

and let D be a general surface in $|H|$ that contains the lines L_1^1, L_1^2 and L_1^3. Then

$$\frac{12}{\lambda^2}-3\gamma=D\cdot\left(\Omega+\gamma\sum_{i=2}^{15}\Big(L_i^1+L_i^2+L_i^3\Big)\right)\geqslant 6\Big(m-\gamma\Big),$$

which implies that $\gamma\geqslant 2m-4/\lambda^2$. Therefore, we see that

$$\frac{12}{\lambda^2}=H\cdot M_1\cdot M_2=45\gamma+H\cdot\Omega\geqslant 45\gamma\geqslant 45\left(2m-\frac{4}{\lambda^2}\right),$$

which implies that $m\leqslant 32/(15\lambda^2)$. In particular, we see that

$$\mathrm{mult}_S\big(\mathcal{M}\big)\leqslant\sqrt{m}\leqslant\frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{15}\lambda}<\frac{3}{2\lambda}<\frac{3}{\mu}.$$

Let $\pi\colon U\to X$ be a blow up of the point S, and let E be the π-exceptional divisor. Then

$$K_U+\mu\bar{\mathcal{M}}+\Big(\mu\mathrm{mult}_S\big(\mathcal{M}\big)-2\Big)E\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}\pi^*\Big(K_X+\mu\mathcal{M}\Big),$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ is the proper transforms of $\mathcal{M}$ on the variety U.

Let $\bar{F}\subset\bar{G}$ be a stabilizer of the point S. Then $\bar{F}\cong\mathbb{S}_4$ by Lemma 5.4, and there is a natural homomorphism $\upsilon\colon\bar{F}\to\mathrm{Aut}(E)$. Note that υ is a monomorphism by Lemma 5.4.

There is an irreducible proper subvariety $C\subsetneq E\cong\mathbb{P}^2$ such that

$$g\big(C\big)\in\mathbb{LCS}\left(U,\ \mu\bar{\mathcal{M}}+\Big(\mu\mathrm{mult}_S\big(\mathcal{M}\big)-2\Big)E\right)$$

for every $g\in\upsilon(\bar{F})$. Then C is a curve by Theorem 2.3 and Lemma 5.4.

Let $\bar{M}_1$ and $\bar{M}_2$ be general surfaces in $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$. Then it follows from [12, Theorem 3.1] that

$$\mathrm{mult}_{g(C)}\Big(\bar{M}_1\cdot\bar{M}_2\Big)\geqslant\frac{4}{\mu^2}\Big(3-\mathrm{mult}_S\big(\mathcal{M}\big)\Big).$$

for every $g\in\upsilon(\bar{F})$. Let δ be the degree in $E\cong\mathbb{P}^2$ of the $\upsilon(\bar{F})$-orbit of the curve C. Then

$$\frac{128}{15\mu^2}\geqslant\frac{32}{15\lambda^2}\geqslant m\geqslant \mathrm{mult}_S^2(\mathcal{M})+\delta\mathrm{mult}_C\Big(\bar{M}_1\cdot\bar{M}_2\Big)\geqslant\mathrm{mult}_S^2(\mathcal{M})+\frac{8}{\mu^2}\Big(3-\mu\mathrm{mult}_S(\mathcal{M})\Big)\geqslant\frac{9}{\mu^2},$$

because $\delta\geqslant 2$ by Lemma 5.4. The obtained contradiction completes the proof. ☐

By Theorem 2.6, the curve S is a smooth curve in $\mathbb{P}^4$ of degree d and genus $g\leqslant d$. Put

$$q=h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_X\big(2H\big)\otimes\mathcal{I}\Big),$$

let Z be the $\bar{G}$-orbit of the curve S, let r be the number of irreducible components of the curve Z.

Lemma 5.14. The equality $r(2d-g+1)=15-q$ holds.

Proof. The equality follows from (5.11) and the Riemann–Roch theorem, because $d\geqslant g$. ☐

Corollary 5.15. The inequality $g\leqslant 14$ holds.

Note that Z is not contained in a hyperplane in $\mathbb{P}^4$, since W is an irreducible $\bar{G}$-representation.

Lemma 5.16. The equality $r=1$ holds.

Proof. Suppose that $r\geqslant 2$. Then $r\leqslant 15$ by Lemma 5.14, which implies that

$$r\in\big\{6,10,15\big\}$$

by Lemma 3.3. If $q=0$, then $2d-g+1=1$ by Lemma 5.14, which is impossible, because $g\leqslant d$.

We have $q\geqslant 1$. Then $r(g+1)\leqslant 14$ and $g\leqslant 1$. If $g=0$, then

$$r\big(2d+1\big)\leqslant 14$$

by Lemma 5.14, which implies a contradictory inequality $d\leqslant 0$. We see that $g=1$. Thus

$$2rd\leqslant 14$$

by Lemma 5.14, which implies that $d=1$ and $g=0$, that contradicts the equality $g=1$. ☐

There is a natural monomorphism $\theta\colon\bar{G}\to\mathrm{Aut}(S)$ (see Lemma 5.2).

Lemma 5.17. The equality $g=10$ holds.

Proof. The required assertion follows from Lemmas 5.14 and 2.8. ☐

The equality $g=10$ and Lemma 5.14 imply that $d\leqslant 12$.

Lemma 5.18. The equality $q=0$ holds.

Proof. Let $\bar{\Psi}\subset\bar{G}$ be a subgroup such that $\bar{\Psi}\cong\mathbb{A}_5$ and the embedding

$$\mathbb{A}_5\cong\bar{\Psi}\subset\bar{G}\cong\mathbb{A}_6$$

is standard. There is a $\bar{\Psi}$-invariant hyperplane section $H\subset X$. Note that $S\not\subset H$. We have

$$\big|H\cap S\big|\leqslant d\leqslant 12,$$

which implies that $|H\cap S|=12$, because $H\cap S$ is $\bar{\Psi}$-invariant. Then $q=0$ by Lemma 5.14. ☐

Let Q be the $\bar{G}$-invariant quadric in $\mathbb{P}^4$ (cf. Example 1.14). Then $S\not\subset Q$, because $q=0$.

Put $\Delta=Q\cap S$. Then $|\Delta|\leqslant 24$. Let $\bar{\Psi}\subset\bar{G}$ be a stabilizer of a point in Δ. Then

$$\big|\bar{\Psi}\big|\geqslant\frac{|\bar{G}|}{|\Delta|}\geqslant\frac{360}{24}>6,$$

which is impossible by Lemma 2.7.

The obtained contradiction completes the proof of Theorem 5.6.

6. Quadric threefold

Let $G \subset \mathbb{SL}(5,\mathbb{C})$ be a subgroup such that $G \cong \mathbb{A}_6$. Put $W = \mathbb{C}^5$ and

$$\bar{G} = \phi(G) \subset \mathrm{Aut}\Big(\mathbb{P}^4\Big) \cong \mathbb{PGL}\Big(5, \mathbb{C}\Big),$$

where $\phi\colon \mathbb{SL}(5,\mathbb{C}) \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^4)$ is the natural projection (cf. Section 5). Then there is a smooth quadric hypersurface $Q \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ that is $\bar{G}$-invariant.

Let us identify Q with a smooth complete intersection in $\mathbb{P}^5$ that is given by the equation

$$\sum_{i=0}^{5} x_i = \sum_{i=0}^{5} x_i^2 = 0 \subset \mathbb{P}^5 \cong \mathrm{Proj}\Big(\mathbb{C}\big[x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5\big]\Big),$$

and let us identify $\bar{G}$ with a subgroup of the group $\mathrm{Aut}(Q)$ (cf. Example 1.14).

Let $O \in Q$ be a point, let $\bar{F} \subset \bar{G}$ be its stabilizer, and let Σ be its $\bar{G}$-orbit.

Lemma 6.1. Suppose that $|\Sigma| \leqslant 30$. Then

- the equality $|\Sigma| = 30$ holds,
- there is cubic hypersurface $X \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ such that $\Sigma \subset X \not\supset Q$.

Proof. One has $|\Sigma| \neq 1$, because W is an irreducible representation of the group $\bar{G}$. Then

$$\big|\Sigma\big| \in \big\{6, 10, 15, 20, 30\big\}$$

by Lemma 3.3. Arguing as in the proof of Lemmas 4.2, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4, we see that $|\Sigma| \in \{20, 30\}$.

Let us consider W as a representation of the group $\bar{F}$. Then W contains some one-dimensional subrepresentation U of the group $\bar{F}$ corresponding to the point $O \in Q$.

Suppose that $|\Sigma| = 20$. Then $\bar{F} \cong (\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$ by Lemma 3.3.

Let W_t and W_1 be the trivial one-dimensional and the non-trivial one-dimensional representations of $\bar{F}$ (see the proof of Lemma 5.3), respectively. Then either $U \cong W_t$ or $U \cong W_1$.

Let χ and χ_1 be the characters of the representations W and W_1, respectively. The values of the characters χ_1 and χ and the structure of the subgroup $\bar{F}$ are given in the following table:

	$[3,3]$	$[3,1,1,1]$	$[2,2,1,1]$	e
$\#$	4	4	9	1
χ	-1	2	1	5
χ_1	1	1	-1	1

where we use notation similar to the ones used in the proofs of Lemmas 3.7, 5.3 and 5.4.

We see that $U \cong W_1$. Thus $[1 : -1 : 1 : -1 : 1 : -1] \in \Sigma$. But $[1 : -1 : 1 : -1 : 1 : -1] \notin Q$.

Therefore, we see that $|\Sigma| = 30$. Then $\bar{F} \cong \mathbb{A}_4$ by Lemma 3.3. The embedding

$$\mathbb{A}_4 \cong \bar{F} \subset \bar{G} \cong \mathbb{A}_6$$

must be standard, because otherwise the representation W would be an irreducible representation of the group $\bar{F}$ (cf. the proof of Lemma 5.4).

There are exactly two $\bar{F}$-invariant points in Q. These points form a subset

$$\Big\{\big[1 : 1 : 1 : 1 : -2 + \sqrt{-2} : -2 - \sqrt{-2}\big], \big[1 : 1 : 1 : 1 : -2 - \sqrt{-2} : -2 + \sqrt{-2}\big]\Big\} \subset \Sigma.$$

Let X be the cubic threefold in $\mathbb{P}^5$ that is given by

$$\sum_{i=0}^{5} x_i = \big(x_0 - x_1\big)\big(x_2 - x_3\big)\big(x_4 - x_5\big) = 0,$$

let P be the point $[1:\omega:\omega^2:1:\omega:\omega^2]\in\mathbb{P}^5$, where ω is a non-trivial cube root of unity. Then

$$\Sigma\subset X\not\ni P\in Q,$$

which completes the proof. □

The main purpose of this section is to prove the following result.

Theorem 6.2. The quadric threefold Q is $\bar{G}$-birationally superrigid.

Suppose that Q is not $\bar{G}$-birationally superrigid. Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 5.6, we see that there is a $\bar{G}$-invariant effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D on Q such that

$$\mathbb{LCS}\Big(Q,D\Big)=\bigcup_{g\in\bar{G}}\Big\{g(S)\Big\},$$

the log pair (Q,D) is log canonical, and $D\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}-\delta K_Q$ for some positive rational number $\delta<2$, where S is a minimal center in $\mathbb{LCS}(Q,D)$ such that either S is a point or a smooth curve.

Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the multiplier ideal sheaf of the log pair (Q,D), let $\mathcal{L}$ be subscheme that is given by the ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I}$, and let H be a general hyperplane section of the threefold $Q\subset\mathbb{P}^3$. Then

$$(6.3)\qquad h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{L}}\otimes\mathcal{O}_Q\big(3H\big)\Big)=h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_Q\big(3H\big)\Big)-h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_Q\big(3H\big)\otimes\mathcal{I}\Big)=30-h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_Q\big(3H\big)\otimes\mathcal{I}\Big)$$

by Theorem 2.1.

Lemma 6.4. The center S is a curve.

Proof. The required assertion follows from (6.3) and Lemma 6.1. □

By Theorem 2.6, the curve S is a smooth curve of degree d and genus $g\leqslant(3d+1)/2$. Put

$$q=h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_Q\big(3H\big)\otimes\mathcal{I}\Big),$$

let Z be the $\bar{G}$-orbit of the curve S, let r be the number of irreducible components of the curve Z.

Lemma 6.5. The equality $r(3d-g+1)=30-q$ holds.

Proof. The equality follows from (6.3) and the Riemann–Roch theorem, because $3d\geqslant 2g-1$. □

Let X be the cubic threefold in $\mathbb{P}^5$ that is given by $\sum_{i=0}^5 x_i=\sum_{i=0}^5 x_i^3=0$ (cf. Example 1.15).

Lemma 6.6. Suppose that $q\geqslant 2$. Then $q\geqslant 5$.

Proof. Suppose that $2\leqslant q\leqslant 4$. It follows from [13] that $\bar{G}$ acts trivially on the q-dimensional vector space $H^0(\mathcal{O}_Q(3H)\otimes\mathcal{I})$. But $Q\cap X$ is the only $\bar{G}$-invariant surface in $|\mathcal{O}_Q(3H)|$. □

Note that Z is not contained in a hyperplane in $\mathbb{P}^4$, since W is an irreducible $\bar{G}$-representation.

Lemma 6.7. The curve S is irreducible.

Proof. Suppose that $r\geqslant 2$. By Lemma 3.3, either $r=6$, or $r\geqslant 10$.

Suppose that $q=0$. If $r=6$, then it follows from Lemma 6.5 that

$$3d-g+1=5$$

which easily leads to a contradiction, because $2g-1\leqslant 3d$. Thus, we see that $r\geqslant 10$ and

$$3d-g+1\leqslant 3$$

by Lemma 6.5. We have $g\leqslant 3$. Then $d=1$ and $g=0$, which contradicts Lemma 6.5.

Suppose that $q=1$. Then $r(3d-g+1)=29$ by Lemma 6.5, which is impossible by Lemma 3.3.

Thus, we see that $q\geqslant 2$. Hence $q\geqslant 5$ by Lemma 6.6. It follows from Lemma 6.5 that

$$r(3d-g+1)\leqslant 25,$$

which implies that $3d-g\leqslant 3$. We have $g\leqslant 4$, because $2g-1\leqslant 3d$. Thus $d\leqslant 2$ and $g=0$.

Applying Lemma 6.5, we get $d=1$ and $r=6$. Then S is a line, and Z is a union of six lines. Let $\bar{\Psi}\subset\bar{G}$ be a stabilizer of the line S. Then $\bar{\Psi}\cong\mathbb{A}_5$ by Lemma 3.3.

Let us consider W as a representation of the group $\bar{\Psi}\cong\mathbb{A}_5$. Then either W is irreducible, or

$$W\cong W_t\oplus W_4,$$

where W_t and W_4 are the trivial one-dimensional and the standard four-dimensional representations of the group $\bar{\Psi}\cong\mathbb{A}_5$, respectively. In both cases, the line S can not be $\bar{\Psi}$-invariant. ☐

We see that $r=1$. Hence $g\leqslant 30$ and $d\leqslant 19$ by (6.3), because $3d\geqslant 2g-1$.

Lemma 6.8. The equalities $d=12$ and $g=10$ hold.

Proof. Let $\Pi_i\subset Q$ be a hyperplane section that is cut out by $x_i=0$, where $i\in\{0,\ldots,5\}$. Then

$$\Pi_0\cap\Pi_1\cap\Pi_2\cap\Pi_3\cap\Pi_4\cap\Pi_5=\varnothing,$$

which implies that, without loss of generality, we may assume that $S\not\subset\Pi_0$.

Let $\bar{\Psi}\subset\bar{G}$ be a stabilizer of the surface Π_0. Then $\bar{\Psi}\cong\mathbb{A}_5$ and the embedding $\bar{\Psi}\subset\bar{G}$ must be standard. Hence we have

$$19\geqslant d=\Pi_0\cdot S\geqslant\big|\Pi_0\cap S\big|,$$

which implies that $d=\Pi_0\cdot S=|\Pi_0\cap S|=12$ by Lemma 2.12, because $\Pi_0\cong\mathbb{P}^1\times\mathbb{P}^1$.

It follows from Theorem 2.17 that $g\leqslant 15$. Thus $g=10$ by Lemma 2.8. ☐

Thus, it follows from Lemma 6.5 that $q=3$, which is impossible by Lemma 6.6.

The obtained contradiction completes the proof of Theorem 6.2.

APPENDIX A. KLEIN CUBIC THREEFOLD

Put $\bar{G}=\mathbb{PSL}(2,\mathbb{F}_{11})$. Let V be a Fano threefold with terminal singularities such that

- the threefold V admits a non-trivial action of the group $\bar{G}$,
- the $\bar{G}$-invariant subgroup of the group $\mathrm{Cl}(V)$ is $\mathbb{Z}$.

Example A.1. If V is a smooth hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}^4$ that is given by the equation

$$x_0^2x_1+x_1^2x_2+x_2^2x_3+x_3^2x_4+x_4^2x_0=0\subset\mathbb{P}^4\cong\mathrm{Proj}\Big(\mathbb{C}\big[x_0,x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4\big]\Big),$$

then V is non-rational by [10, Theorem 0.12], and $\mathrm{Aut}(V_3)\cong\bar{G}$ by [1].

Example A.2 ([31, Example 2.9])**.** There is a non-trivial action of the group $\bar{G}$ in $\mathrm{Gr}(2,6)$, and

$$\mathrm{Pic}\Big(\mathrm{Gr}\big(2,6\big)\Big)=\mathbb{Z}\big[H\big]$$

for some very ample divisor H. Then $|H|$ gives an embedding $\zeta\colon\mathrm{Gr}(2,6)\to\mathbb{P}^{14}$, which induces a non-trivial action of the group $\bar{G}$ on $\mathbb{P}^{14}$. Put

$$V=\zeta\Big(\mathrm{Gr}\big(2,6\big)\Big)\cap\Pi$$

where Π is the unique $\bar{G}$-invariant linear subspace $\Pi\subset\mathbb{P}^{14}$ such that $\dim(\Pi)=9$. Then

- the variety V is a smooth Fano threefold such that $\mathrm{Pic}(V)\cong\mathbb{Z}$ and $-K_V^3=14$ (see [19]),
- the variety V admits a non-trivial action of the group $\bar{G}$.

Let V_3 and V_{14} be the threefolds that are constructed in Examples A.1 and A.2, respectively.

Theorem A.3 ([31, Theorem 1.5])**.** There is a $\bar{G}$-equivariant birational map

$$\chi\colon V\dashrightarrow U$$

such that either $U\cong V_3$ or $U\cong V_{14}$.

Remark A.4 (see [31, Remark 2.10]). The varieties V_3 and V_{14} are birationally equivalent.

The main purpose of this section is to prove the following result (cf. [31, Remark 2.10]).

Theorem A.5. The varieties V_3 and V_{14} are $\bar{G}$-birationally superrigid.

Corollary A.6. The birational map $\chi\colon V \dashrightarrow U$ in Theorem A.3 is biregular.

Corollary A.7. There exists no $\bar{G}$-equivariant birational map $V_{14} \dashrightarrow V_3$.

Corollary A.8. Up to conjugation, the group

$$\mathrm{Bir}\big(V_3\big) \cong \mathrm{Bir}\big(V_{14}\big)$$

contains exactly 2 subgroups that are isomorphic to the simple group $\mathbb{PSL}(2,\mathbb{F}_{11})$.

Let us prove that V_{14} is $\bar{G}$-birationally superrigid. Suppose that V_{14} is not $\bar{G}$-birationally superrigid. There is a $\bar{G}$-invariant linear system $\mathcal{M}$ without fixed components such that

$$K_{V_{14}} + \lambda\mathcal{M} \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} 0$$

for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$. Then $(V_{14}, \lambda\mathcal{M})$ is not canonical (see [5, Theorem 1.4.1], [7, Corollary A.15]).

There is $\mu \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\mu < 2\lambda$ and $(V_{14}, \mu\mathcal{M})$ is strictly log canonical.

Let $S \subset V_{14}$ be a minimal center in $\mathbb{LCS}(V_{14}, \mu\mathcal{M})$. Then $\dim(S) \in \{0, 1\}$.

By Lemma 2.10, there is a $\bar{G}$-invariant effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D on the threefold V_{14} such that

$$\mathbb{LCS}\big(V_{14}, D\big) = \bigcup_{g\in\bar{G}} \Big\{g(S)\Big\}$$

and $D \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} -\epsilon K_{V_{14}}$, where ϵ is a positive rational number such that $\epsilon < 2$.

Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the multiplier ideal sheaf of the log pair (V_{14}, D), and let $\mathcal{L}$ be the log canonical singularities subscheme of the log pair (V_{14}, D). Then it follows from Theorem 2.1 that

$$h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{L}} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{V_{14}}(H)\Big) = h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{V_{14}}(H)\Big) - h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{V_{14}}(H) \otimes \mathcal{I}\Big) = 10 - h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{V_{14}}(H) \otimes \mathcal{I}\Big), \tag{A.9}$$

where $H \in |-K_{V_{14}}|$.

Lemma A.10. The equality $\dim(S) = 0$ is impossible.

Proof. Suppose that $\dim(S) = 0$. Let $\bar{F} \subset \bar{G}$ be a stabilizer of a point in $\mathrm{LCS}(V_{14}, D)$. Then

$$\Big|\mathrm{LCS}\Big(V_{14}, D\Big)\Big| \leqslant 10$$

by (A.9). Thus, we see that $|\bar{F}| \geqslant |\bar{G}|/10 = 66$. Hence, we must have

$$\mathrm{LCS}\Big(V_{14}, D\Big) = S$$

and $\bar{F} = \bar{G}$, because there are no proper subgroups of $\bar{G}$ of order greater than 60 (see [13]).

The action of $\bar{G}$ on the tangent space to V_{14} at the point S gives a faithful three-dimensional representation of the group $\bar{G}$, which does not exist (see [13]). □

It follows from Theorem 2.6 that S is a smooth curve of genus g such that $2g - 2 < S \cdot H$.

Lemma A.11. The curve S is $\bar{G}$-invariant.

Proof. Let Z be the $\bar{G}$-orbit of the curve S. Then $Z = \mathcal{L}$, because (V_{14}, D) is log canonical.

Suppose that $S \neq Z$. Let r be the number of irreducible components of Z. Then $r \geqslant 11$, because there is no nontrivial homomorphism $\bar{G} \to \mathbb{S}_r$ if $1 < r \leqslant 10$.

Using (A.9) and the Riemann–Roch theorem, we see that

$$10 \geqslant 10 - h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{V_{14}}(H) \otimes \mathcal{I}\Big) = h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{L}} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{V_{14}}(H)\Big) = r\Big(S \cdot H - g + 1\Big) \geqslant r,$$

because $\mathcal{L} = Z$ and $2g - 2 < S \cdot H$. Thus, we see that $r \leqslant 10$. □

Therefore, there is a natural homomorphism $\theta\colon \bar{G}\to \mathrm{Aut}(S)$.

Lemma A.12. The homomorphism θ is a monomorphism.

Proof. Suppose that θ is not a monomorphism. Then

$$\ker\big(\theta\big)=\bar{G},$$

because $\bar{G}$ simple. Let P be a point in S. Then P is $\bar{G}$-invariant. The action of the group $\bar{G}$ on the tangent space to the threefold V_{14} at the point P gives its faithful three-dimensional representation, which does not exist (see [13]). ☐

Lemma A.13. The inequality $g\geqslant 11$ holds.

Proof. Suppose that $g\leqslant 10$. Then $g\leqslant 1$ by Theorem 2.15 since $|\bar{G}|=660$.

Moreover, it follows from the classification of finite subgroups of $\mathbb{PSL}(2,\mathbb{C})$ that the monomorphism θ does not exist if $g=0$. Thus, we see that $g=1$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(S)$ contains a simple non-abelian subgroup $\theta(\bar{G})\cong\mathbb{PSL}(2,\mathbb{F}_{11})$, which is impossible, because $\mathrm{Aut}(S)$ is solvable. ☐

Using (A.9) and the Riemann–Roch theorem, we see that

$$10\geqslant h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{L}}\otimes\mathcal{O}_{V_{14}}\big(H\big)\Big)=S\cdot H-g+1,$$

because $\mathcal{L}=Z$ and $2g-2<S\cdot H$. Then $g\geqslant S\cdot H-9$. But $2g-2<S\cdot H$. Hence

$$2\Big(S\cdot H\Big)-20\leqslant 2g-2<S\cdot H,$$

which implies that $S\cdot H\leqslant 19$. Therefore, $g\leqslant 10$, which is impossible by Lemma A.13.

The obtained contradiction shows that V_{14} is $\bar{G}$-birationally superrigid.

To complete the proof of Theorem A.5, we assume that the threefold V_3 is not $\bar{G}$-birationally superrigid. Then there is a $\bar{G}$-invariant linear system $\mathcal{M}$ without fixed components such that

$$K_{V_3}+\lambda\mathcal{M}\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}0$$

for some $\lambda\in\mathbb{Q}_{>0}$. Then $(V_3,\lambda\mathcal{M})$ is not canonical (see [5, Theorem 1.4.1], [7, Corollary A.15]).

There is $\mu\in\mathbb{Q}$ such that $\mu<2\lambda$ and $(V_3,\mu\mathcal{M})$ is strictly log canonical.

Let $S\subset V_3$ be a minimal center in $\mathbb{LCS}(V_3,\mu\mathcal{M})$. Then $\dim(S)\in\{0,1\}$.

By Lemma 2.10, there is a $\bar{G}$-invariant effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D on the threefold V_3 such that

$$\mathbb{LCS}\big(V_3,D\big)=\bigcup_{g\in\bar{G}}\Big\{g(S)\Big\}$$

and $D\sim_{\mathbb{Q}}-\epsilon K_{V_3}$, where ϵ is a positive rational number such that $\epsilon<2$.

Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the multiplier ideal sheaf of the log pair (V_3,D), and let $\mathcal{L}$ be the log canonical singularities subscheme of the log pair (V_3,D). Then it follows from Theorem 2.1 that

$$h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{L}}\otimes\mathcal{O}_{V_3}\big(2H\big)\Big)=h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{V_3}\big(2H\big)\Big)-h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{V_3}\big(2H\big)\otimes\mathcal{I}\Big)=15-h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{V_3}\big(2H\big)\otimes\mathcal{I}\Big),\tag{A.14}$$

where H is an ample generator of the group $\mathrm{Pic}(V_3)$.

Lemma A.15. The equality $\dim(S)=0$ is impossible.

Proof. Suppose that $\dim(S)=0$. Let $\bar{F}\subset\bar{G}$ be a stabilizer of a point in $\mathrm{LCS}(V_3,D)$. Then

$$\big|\bar{F}\big|=\frac{|\bar{G}|}{\Big|\mathrm{LCS}\Big(V_3,D\Big)\Big|}\geqslant\frac{|\bar{G}|}{15}=44$$

by (A.14). Thus, if $\bar{F}\ne\bar{G}$, then $\bar{F}$ is isomorphic to either $\mathbb{A}_5$ or $\mathbb{Z}_{11}\rtimes\mathbb{Z}_5$ (see [13]).

We may identify $\bar{G}$ with a subgroup in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^4)$. There is a subgroup $G\subset\mathbb{SL}(5,\mathbb{C})$ such that

$$\bar{G}=\phi(G)\subset\mathrm{Aut}\Big(\mathbb{P}^4\Big)\cong\mathbb{PGL}\Big(5,\mathbb{C}\Big)$$

and $G \cong \bar{G}$, where $\phi\colon \mathbb{SL}(5,\mathbb{C}) \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{P}^4)$ is the natural projection.

Put $W = \mathbb{C}^5$. Then W is an irreducible representation of the group G (see [1]), which implies that $\bar{F} \neq \bar{G}$. If F is a subgroup of the group G such that

$$\phi(F) = \bar{F},$$

then one can show that W is an irreducible representation of the group F, which is a contradiction. □

It follows from Theorem 2.6 that S is a smooth curve of genus g such that $g \leqslant S \cdot H$.

Lemma A.16. The curve S is $\bar{G}$-invariant.

Proof. Let Z be the $\bar{G}$-orbit of the curve S. Then $Z = \mathcal{L}$, because (V_3, D) is log canonical.

Suppose that $S \neq Z$. Let r be the number of irreducible components of Z. Then

$$r \geqslant 11,$$

because there is no non-trivial homomorphism $\bar{G} \to \mathbb{S}_r$ in the case when $1 < r \leqslant 10$.

Using (A.14) and the Riemann–Roch theorem, we see that

$$15 \geqslant 15 - h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{V_3}(2H) \otimes \mathcal{I}\Big) = h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{L}} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{V_3}(2H)\Big) = r\Big(2S \cdot H - g + 1\Big),$$

because $\mathcal{L} = Z$ and $g \leqslant S \cdot H$. Since $r \geqslant 11$, one has

$$2S \cdot H - g + 1 \leqslant 1,$$

which contradicts the inequality $g \leqslant S \cdot H$. □

We see that there is a natural homomorphism $\theta\colon \bar{G} \to \mathrm{Aut}(S)$. Arguing as in Lemma A.12, we see that θ is a monomorphism. Arguing as in Lemma A.13, one obtaines $g \geqslant 11$.

By Theorem 2.15 we may assume that $g = 14$. Let a_i be the number of points on S whose stabilizers in $\bar{G}$ are isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_i$. Using the Riemann–Hurwitz formula, we see that

$$2g - 2 = \big(2\bar{g} - 2\big) \cdot \big|\bar{G}\big| + 330a_2 + 440a_3 + 528a_5 + 550a_6 + 600a_{11},$$

where $\bar{g}$ is the genus of the quotient curve $S/\bar{G}$ (cf. the proof of Lemma 2.8). Then $\bar{g} = 0$. We have

$$1294 - 528a_5 = 330a_2 + 440a_3 + 550a_6 + 600a_{11},$$

which leads to a contradiction. The obtained contradiction completes the proof of Theorem A.5.

Appendix B. Del Pezzo fibrations

by Yuri Prokhorov*

Let X be a threefold with at worst terminal singularities such that the group $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ has a subgroup $\bar{G} \cong \mathbb{A}_6$, and let $\pi\colon X \to \mathbb{P}^1$ be a $\bar{G}$-Mori fibration (see [7, Definition A.1]).

The goal of this appendix is to prove the following result.

Theorem B.1. The isomorphism $X \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ holds, and π is the projection to the first factor.

Recall that there exists no monomorphism $\bar{G} \to \mathbb{PGL}(2,\mathbb{C})$.

Lemma B.2 (cf. [31, Lemma 4.5])**.** Let Y be a threefold with at worst terminal singularities such that $\mathrm{Aut}(Y)$ has a subgroup $\bar{G} \cong \mathbb{A}_6$. Then Y contains no $\bar{G}$-invariant points.

---

*This work is partially supported by the grants RFBR 08-01-00395-a, NSh-1983.2008.1 and NSh-1987.2008.1.

Proof. Suppose that Y contains a $\bar{G}$-invariant point $P \in Y$. Let us show that this assumption leads to a contradiction. Let $T_{P,Y}$ be the Zariski tangent space to Y at the point P. Then

$$\dim\Big(T_{P,Y}\Big) \geqslant 5,$$

because $\bar{G}$ has no faithful representations of dimension less than 5. We see that Y is not Gorenstein at the point P (see [32, Section 3]). Let us regard $(Y \ni P)$ as an analytic germ.

Let r be the Gorenstein index of the singularity (Y, P), let $\pi\colon (Y^\sharp, P^\sharp) \to (Y, P)$ be the index one cover (see [32, Section 3.5]), where $P^\sharp = \pi^{-1}(P)$. Then

$$\pi\colon Y^\sharp \setminus \{P^\sharp\} \to Y \setminus \{P\}$$

is the topological universal cover (of degree r). Thus, there is an exact sequence of groups

$$\begin{tikzcd} 1 \arrow[r] & \mathbb{Z}_r \arrow[r, "\alpha"] & \bar{G}^\sharp \arrow[r, "\beta"] & \bar{G} \arrow[r] & 1 \end{tikzcd},$$

where $\bar{G}^\sharp$ is a finite subgroup in $\mathrm{Aut}(Y^\sharp, P^\sharp)$. Since $\bar{G}$ is simple, this is a central extension.

The group $\bar{G}^\sharp$ naturally acts on the Zariski tangent space $T_{P^\sharp,Y^\sharp}$ to $Y^\sharp$ at the point $P^\sharp$.

Recall that $(Y^\sharp, P^\sharp)$ is a hypersurface singularity. Hence, we have

$$\dim\Big(T_{P^\sharp,Y^\sharp}\Big) \leqslant 4.$$

By the classification of three-dimensional terminal singularities (see [32, Section 6.1]) the action of the group $\alpha(\mathbb{Z}_r)$ on $T_{P^\sharp,Y^\sharp}$ in some coordinate system has one of the following forms:

- either $\dim(T_{P^\sharp,Y^\sharp}) = 3$ and $(x_1, x_2, x_3) \longmapsto (\varepsilon x_1, \varepsilon^{-1} x_2, \varepsilon^a x_3)$,
- or $\dim(T_{P^\sharp,Y^\sharp}) = 4$ and $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \longmapsto (\varepsilon x_1, \varepsilon^{-1} x_2, \varepsilon^a x_3, x_4)$,
- or $\dim(T_{P^\sharp,Y^\sharp}) = r = 4$ and $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \longmapsto (\sqrt{-1}x_1, -\sqrt{-1}x_2, \pm\sqrt{-1}x_3, -x_4)$,

where ε is a primitive r-th root of unity and $\gcd(r, a) = 1$.

The case $\dim(T_{P^\sharp,Y^\sharp}) = 4$ and $r = 2$ is impossible, because the group $2.\mathbb{A}_6$ does not have faithful three-dimensional representations. Therefore, the central subgroup

$$\alpha\big(\mathbb{Z}_r\big) \subset \bar{G}^\sharp$$

has at least 2 different eigenvalues. Then $T_{P^\sharp,Y^\sharp}$ is a reducible representation of the group $\bar{G}^\sharp$.

If $\dim(T_{P^\sharp,Y^\sharp}) = 4$, then the subgroup $\alpha(\mathbb{Z}_r)$ has at least 3 different eigenvalues.

Hence, in every possible case, the group $\bar{G}^\sharp$ has a subrepresentation of dimension at least 2, which is impossible, because the group $\bar{G} \cong \mathbb{A}_6$ does no admit any embedding to $\mathbb{PGL}(2, \mathbb{C})$. □

Lemma B.3 (cf. [14])**.** *Let S be a smooth del Pezzo surface such that S admits a non-trivial action of the group $\bar{G}$. Then $S \cong \mathbb{P}^2$.*

Proof. Note that $S \ncong \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, because there exists no monomorphism $\bar{G} \to \mathbb{PGL}(2, \mathbb{C})$.

Suppose that $S \ncong \mathbb{P}^2$. Let us derive a contradiction.

If $K_S^2 \geqslant 5$, then the action of $\bar{G}$ on $\mathrm{Pic}(S)$ is trivial, because $\mathrm{rk}\,\mathrm{Pic}(S) \leqslant 5$ and the canonical class K_S is $\bar{G}$-invariant. Then any (-1)-curve on S must be invariant, a contradiction.

Let C be a $\bar{G}$-invariant curve in $|-K_S|$. Then every component of the curve C is either rational or elliptic curve. Moreover, the curve C consists of at most 4 components, which immediately implies that C is not $\bar{G}$-invariant, because $\bar{G}$ is simple.

Put $V = H^0(\mathcal{O}_S(-K_S))$. By the above, the group $\bar{G}$ acts non-trivially on V. Then

$$4 \geqslant K_S^2 = h^0\Big(\mathcal{O}_S\big(-K_S\big)\Big) - 1 \geqslant 4,$$

which implies that $K_S^2 = 4$, and the space V is an irreducible five-dimensional representation of the group $\bar{G}$, because $\bar{G}$ has no non-trivial representations of dimension less than 5 (see [13]).

We see that $S = Q_1 \cap Q_2 \subset \mathbb{P}^4$, where Q_1 and Q_2 are irreducible quadric hypersurfaces.

The action of the group $\bar{G}$ on the space V induces its action on $\mathbb{P}^4$.

Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the pencil generated by Q_1 and Q_2 is $\bar{G}$-invariant. Then $\mathcal{P}$ is $\bar{G}$-invariant. Since there is no monomorphism $\bar{G}\to\mathbb{PGL}(2,\mathbb{C})$, both quadrics Q_1 and Q_2 are $\bar{G}$-invariant, which is impossible, because otherwise the vertex of a degenerate quadric in pencil is a fixed point. $\square$

Corollary B.4. Let F_π be a general fiber of the morphism π. Then $K^2_{F_\pi}=9$

Let F be any scheme fiber of the morphism $\pi\colon X\to\mathbb{P}^1$. Then F is $\bar{G}$-invariant.

Lemma B.5. The threefold X is smooth and $F\cong\mathbb{P}^2$.

Proof. First we show that $\mathrm{Supp}(F)$ is irreducible, normal and has at worst Kawamata log terminal singularities. This step is similar to the proof of [27, Proposition 2.6].

Take $\mu\in\mathbb{Q}$ such that $(X,\mu F)$ is strictly log-canonical. Then there are a $\bar{G}$-invariant π-ample divisor H and small positive δ_1 and $\delta_2\in\mathbb{Q}$ such that $(X,(\mu-\delta_1)F+\delta_2H)$ is log canonical and

$$\mathbb{LCS}\Big(X,(\mu-\delta_1)F+\delta_2H\Big)=\bigcup_{g\in\bar{G}}g(S),$$

where S is a minimal center in $\mathbb{LCS}(X,\mu F)$ (cf. Lemma 2.10 or the proof of [27, Proposition 2.6]).

Put $D=(\mu-\delta_1)F+\delta_2H$. Then $\mathrm{LCS}(X,D)$ is a $\bar{G}$-orbit of the center S.

By Theorem 2.3, the locus $\mathrm{LCS}(X,D)$ is connected. It follows from Lemma 2.5 that

$$\mathbb{LCS}\big(X,D\big)=S,$$

which implies that S is not a point by Lemma B.2.

If S is a curve, then $S\cong\mathbb{P}^1$ by Theorem 2.6, which is again impossible by Lemma B.2.

We see that S is a $\bar{G}$-invariant surface. Then $S=\mathrm{Supp}(F)$, because π is a $\bar{G}$-Mori fibred space.

By Theorem 2.6, the surface S is normal and has Kawamata log terminal singularities.

Let $\Sigma\subset S$ be a subset consisting of points where S is not Cartier. If F is not reduced, then

$$1\leqslant\big|\Sigma\big|\leqslant 4$$

by [27, Theorem 1.1]. Since Σ is $\bar{G}$-invariant, we see that $\Sigma=\varnothing$ by Lemma B.2.

We see that F is a reduced normal surface having only quotient singularities, which implies that F is a degeneration of $\mathbb{P}^2$ by Corollary B.4. Hence, the inequality

$$\big|\mathrm{Sing}(F)\big|\leqslant 3$$

holds (see [25, Main Theorem], [15, Corollary 1.2]). So, the surface F is smooth by Lemma B.2, which immediately implies that $F\cong\mathbb{P}^2$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem B.1. It follows from Lemma B.5 that every scheme fiber of the morphism π is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}^2$. By [3, Proposition V.4.1], there are integers $b\geqslant a\geqslant 0$ such that

$$X\cong\mathrm{Proj}\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}\oplus\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}\big(a\big)\oplus\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}\big(b\big)\Big).$$

Recall that the action of the group $\bar{G}$ on the base $\mathbb{P}^1$ is trivial.

By Lemma B.2, every fiber of the morphism π contains no $\bar{G}$-fixed points nor $\bar{G}$-invariant lines, which implies that $a=b=0$ and so $X\cong\mathbb{P}^1\times\mathbb{P}^2$. $\square$

References

[1] A. Adler, *On the automorphism group of a certain cubic threefold*
American Journal of Mathematics **100** (1978), 1275–1280

[2] E. Arbarello, M. Cornalba, P. Griffiths, J. Harris, *Geometry of algebraic curves. Volume I*
Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften **267** (1985) Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg

[3] W. Barth, C. Peters, A. Van de Ven, *Compact complex surfaces*
Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984

[4] T. Breuer, *Characters and automorphism groups of compact Riemann surfaces*
London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series **280**, Cambridge University Press, 2000

[5] I. Cheltsov, *Birationally rigid Fano varieties*
Russian Mathematical Surveys **60** (2005), 875–965

[6] I. Cheltsov, *Log canonical thresholds of del Pezzo surfaces*
Geometric and Functional Analysis, **18** (2008), 1118–1144

[7] I. Cheltsov, *Two local inequalities*
arXiv:math/0908.0401 (2009)

[8] I. Cheltsov, C. Shramov, *Log canonical thresholds of smooth Fano threefolds*
Russian Mathematical Surveys **63** (2008), 73–180

[9] I. Cheltsov, C. Shramov, *On exceptional quotient singularities*
arXiv:math/0909.0918 (2009)

[10] C. Clemens, P. Griffiths, *The intermediate Jacobian of the cubic threefold*
Annals of Mathematics **95** (1972), 73–100

[11] A. Corti, *Factorizing birational maps of threefolds after Sarkisov*
Journal of Algebraic Geometry **4** (1995), 223–254

[12] A. Corti, *Singularities of linear systems and 3-fold birational geometry*
L.M.S. Lecture Note Series **281** (2000), 259–312

[13] J. Conway, R. Curtis, S. Norton, R. Parker, R. Wilson, *Atlas of finite groups*
Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1985

[14] I. Dolgachev, V. Iskovskikh, *Finite subgroups of the plane Cremona group*
arXiv:math.AG/0610595 (2006)

[15] P. Hacking, Yu. Prokhorov, *Smoothable del Pezzo surfaces with quotient singularities*
arXiv:math/0808.1550 (2008), to appear in Compositio Math.

[16] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic geometry*
Graduate Texts in Mathematics **52** (1977) Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg

[17] A. Huckleberry, M. Sauer, *On the order of the automorphism group of a surface of general type*
Mathematische Zeitschrift **205** (1990), 321–329

[18] B. Hunt, *The geometry of some special arithmetic quotients*
Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1637** (Springer–Verlag, New York, 1996)

[19] V. Iskovskikh, Yu. Prokhorov, *Fano varieties*
Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences **47** (1999) Springer, Berlin

[20] V. Iskovskikh, A. Pukhlikov, *Birational automorphisms of multidimensional algebraic manifolds*
Journal of Mathematical Sciences **82** (1996), 3528–3613

[21] Y. Kawamata, *On Fujita's freeness conjecture for* 3*-folds and* 4*-folds*
Mathematische Annalen **308** (1997), 491–505

[22] Y. Kawamata, *Subadjunction of log canonical divisors II*
American Journal of Mathematics **120** (1998), 893–899

[23] J. Kollár, *Singularities of pairs*
Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics **62** (1997), 221–287

[24] R. Lazarsfeld, *Positivity in algebraic geometry* **II**
Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004

[25] M. Manetti, *Normal degenerations of the complex projective plane*
Journal für die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik **419** (1991), 89–11

[26] M. Mella, *Birational geometry of quartic 3-folds II: the importance of being* $\mathbb{Q}$*-factorial*
Mathematische Annalen **330** (2004), 107–126

[27] S. Mori, Yu. Prokhorov, *Multiple fibers of del Pezzo fibrations*
Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics **264** (2009), 131–145

[28] S. Mukai, *Curves and symmetric spaces*
Proceedings of the Japan Academy, Series A, Mathematical Sciences **68** (1992), 7–10

[29] I. Nieto, *The normalizer of the level* $(2,2)$*-Heisenberg group*
Manuscripta Mathematica **76** (1992), 257–267

[30] K. Pettersen, *On nodal determinantal quartic hypersurfaces in* $\mathbb{P}^4$
Thesis, University of Oslo (1998)

[31] Yu. Prokhorov, *Simple finite subgroups of the Cremona group of rank* 3
arXiv:math/0908.0678 (2009)

[32] M. Reid, *Young person's guide to canonical singularities*
Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics **46** (1987), 345–414

[33] V. Shokurov, *Three-fold log flips*
Russian Academy of Sciences, Izvestiya Mathematics **40** (1993), 95–202

[34] C. Shramov, *Birational automorphisms of nodal quartic threefolds*
arXiv:math/0803.4348 (2008)

[35] G. Tian, *On Kähler–Einstein metrics on certain Kähler manifolds with* $c_1(M) > 0$
Inventiones Mathematicae **89** (1987), 225–246

[36] G. Tian, S.-T. Yau, *Kähler–Einstein metrics metrics on complex surfaces with* $\mathrm{C}_1 > 0$
Communications in Mathematical Physics **112** (1987), 175–203

[37] J. A. Todd, *Configurations defined by six lines in space of three dimensions*
Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society **29** (1933), 52–68

[38] D. Vazzana, *Invariants and projections of six lines in projective space*
Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **353** (2001), 2673–2688

University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, UK

I.Cheltsov@ed.ac.uk shramov@mccme.ru